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Document part: Policy ID1 - Infrastructure and delivery
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2803  Respondent: 8555041 / Adrian Platt  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the total lack of any substantial information on providing adequate infrastructure for the developments proposed. It is simply not good enough to make bland statements about infrastructure, since, before any development of the frightening level proposed is considered, fully costed and detailed infrastructure plans for items such as new schools, Medical Centres etc. must be clear.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5664  Respondent: 8555297 / Mrs G M Aish  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The infrastructure in many of the areas specified is completely incapable of taking the large increase in the number of people and cars. Roads are already busy and often grid locked. drainage is unable to cope. and car parking at shops and stations is already saturated. The Plan does not adequately provide for the additional schools. doctor's surgeries. other medical care. libraries. policing. etc. Air quality is already at serious levels of pollution, particularly along the A3 corridor; recent research has shown the serious harm being done to the lungs. particularly of young children. by the high levels, in breach of regulations, of NOx gases and particulates. I object that all these considerat ions have been ignored.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2598  Respondent: 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The strengthening of conditionality in point (3) is supported.

However, it is not clear that the infrastructure proposed would be adequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8518</th>
<th>Respondent: 8556673 / Andrew French</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No provision, either in terms of land or finance, has been made for the required increase in primary and secondary school provision that this would entail and yet the existing local schools are fully subscribed;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The existing infrastructure in East and West Horsley would be unable to cope with the significant growth in the village settlements, particularly where site development is incremental. This includes the existing village shopping provision, roads, public transport (particularly the local train network) and utilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6271</th>
<th>Respondent: 8557985 / Artington Parish Council (Philip Gorton)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major external development and its impact on local minor roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The draft plan contains little information on local infrastructure. Artington parish and neighbouring communities have particular concern that the proposed neighbouring major developments would have a serious impact on the fragile local network of minor roads, especially the B3000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although not within Arlington parish, Blackwell Farm has been identified as a potential new 'Urban Local Centre' with a potential for 1800 homes. In addition there is the potential for 100 homes at Broadford Business Park and the major development of Dunsfold New Town. If implemented, these major developments would have a significant impact on existing communities such as Puttenham, Compton, Famcombe, Peasmarsh, Shalford and Artington, particularly with regard to the local road network. Of particular concern is the already overloaded and inadequate B3000 rail bridge, which has been risk-assessed as being unsafe and in urgent need of replacement. This hazardous nature of this narrow humpbacked rail bridge on the 83000 is compounded by its limited visibility. There are no plans or available funding to provide separate provision for cyclists and pedestrians, nor update the bridge to make it suitable for today's volume of traffic, which exceeds 5 million vehicles per year, a num ber being driven by the opening of the Hindhead Tunnel and the A3 bottleneck moving to Guildford resulting in drivers seeking alternative routes to the A3. This number is likely to be greatly exceeded if the potential developments mentioned above proceed resulting in gridlock on the already overloaded local minor roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing infrastructure simply does not support the proposed house build, particularly having regard for Guildford's exceptional 'gap town' characteristics, and the draft Local Plan does not recognise the problem. This is clearly untenable. Going forward, the supporting infrastructure must be commensurate with the future housing population. It is crucially important firstly to demonstrate the feasibility of implementing the necessary infrastructure improvements and then, where appropriate, the cost of providing such needs to be factored into the overall development cost. Not to do so would be irresponsible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11420</th>
<th>Respondent: 8559297 / Holy Trinity Amenity Group (Robert Bromham)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
II. Infrastructure and delivery, P108.

We welcome the objective of associated infrastructure being available to occupants as soon as it is needed. However stronger control is needed; we suggest that occupancy is not allowed until it can be shown that the infrastructure is in place.

Our Group would welcome the opportunity to be part of the “officer working group” to prioritise the CIL spending for our area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3342  Respondent: 8560257 / Patricia Camp  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure - Drains

There is a serious under capacity of existing sewers and the treatment works to cope with the large number of dwellings proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3343  Respondent: 8560257 / Patricia Camp  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Schools

I am concerned and object to the issue that more families moving into the village would create fewer places for families already with children approaching school age.

The Raleigh (no room on the site for expansion) is the only primary state school in the village and has been full every year for many years.

Secondary school places are limited in number at the Howard of Effingham and other secondary schools, also full are a greater distance from the village.

Village facilities

West Horsley is a small village with very few facilities, which are not enough for the current population.
Parking is very difficult most times of the day for people using the shops and library. The village does have three disabled parking spaces close to the shops and a small car park. It is very difficult getting appointments and parking at the single Medical Centre serving East and West Horsley plus areas beyond the village.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17682</th>
<th>Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of infrastructure (excluding transport and traffic) has not been assessed by the Society in this response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic and transportation studies are (in many parts) very detailed and these were issued on the same day as the consultation commenced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan at Figure 12 [Figure 4.9 from the Surrey County Council Waverley &amp; Guildford Model Validation Report] shows various routes assessed for journey times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the scope and scale of development in other neighbouring authorities (especially Rushmoor), impact from these other authorities’ land allocations should be taken into account in assessing the Borough’s roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The link from the station to the University, Hospital, Research Park, Park Barn and proposed further development at Blackwell Farm among others, is excluded from the plan on Figure 12 because it is not a classified road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This means that some of the analysis fails to take into account the extent of use of ‘secondary’ roads by the employment, infrastructure and residential sectors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 13 shows the same plan but with Guildford Park Road, Madrid Road, The Chase, etc., marked on it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guildford Society supports Guildford Vision Group’s proposed linkage by new bridges (‘the GVG Crossing’) of the York Road and Madrid Road routes (see Figure 14, below).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal would avoid east-west traffic having to use the riverside and town centre road network – enabling greater pedestrian priority in that area. This, coupled with one of the Town Centre Master plan solutions, would derive substantial benefits for the town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the new road were treated as an extension of the A246 to the hospital, university and Park Barn, this would allow more comprehensive planning of the Integrated Transport Network.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, at Figure 15, below, we have superimposed the Town Centre Master Plan Scenario 1 solution onto the GVG Crossing to further illustrate the deflection of traffic away from the core town centre area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Society recognises that the Town Centre Master Plan is still work in progress and does not form a settled part of the Reg19 Consultation Draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Society does believe, however, that the modelling of traffic scenarios must include the proper weighting for the linkage of York Road to Madrid Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part of the solution needs to be an understanding of the roles and interaction between the railway station and the bus network.

Position Statement 3 - Infrastructure

The Society fears there is an infrastructure funding circle that may never be closed, but that developers will continue to require their sites to be assessed on the local impacts of their scheme (development being allowed as long as that impact is not ‘severe’).

The Society believes that the Local Plan must be configured to reflect the constraints where funding commitments have not been made, and where it is either not within the Council’s control (eg., Strategic Highway Network, Network Rail, etc), or beyond its the financial reach. Consequently, the Society believes the Council should:

64.1. Constrain the development within the Local Plan to that level that can be supported by existing infrastructure and through new or improved infrastructure where funding and delivery are either within the gift of the Council or firm commitment and all necessary approvals have been received. 64.2. Establish within the Council’s Corporate Plan the intent to deliver additional infrastructure and to obtain the necessary approvals and funding to be in control of its delivery;

64.3. Relax constraints in the Local Plan as part of the regular review process to enable further delivery of development based upon the prior delivery of infrastructure.

The Society is concerned that essential elements of the Transportation Evidence Base (launched on the same day as the Reg19 Consultation) show that some roads (notably Guildford Park Road, Madrid Road and The Chase) are not adequately analysed as they do not form part of the A-road classification network in Guildford. This is a major route which only stands to become more heavily used as proposed land allocations to the west of Guildford (inside and beyond the Borough) have an effect on this route.

Position Statement 5 – Town centre

The Society is keen to see the comprehensive and aspirational regeneration of the town centre.

The Society believes this should be broadly along the lines of the vision and subsequent study prepared by Allies & Morrison but with some crucial comments as follows:

67.1. The absence of provision (in the Reg19 Consultation Draft) for most uses (including the expected traffic generated by those uses), infrastructure requirements and housing numbers makes the overall Draft Local Plan somewhat unrealistic;

67.2. The reliance on a subsequent Area Action Plan is understandable but, as it is not at all envisioned in the Reg19 Consultation Draft, the Local plan itself may be unsound – for example as it relates to commuter parking versus a presumption in the infrastructure evidence base of a reduction of generation of traffic movements in the town centre;

67.3. There is a risk that the Council is standing across the gap between two railway carriages (the Local Plan and the Town Centre Master Plan); the carriages are not yet coupled together, and Guildford risks being torn apart as the gap widens.

67.4. The Society (along with many other residents’ groups and businesses) strongly supports the principle of the GVG crossing, but this option has not even been fully modelled as part of the wider traffic and transport analysis – largely because the route from the Farnham Road Bridge (A31) to the Cathedral, University, Hospital, Research Park and in the region of 7,500 households, is not classified as an A or B route.

The Society would regret this Local Plan process if it fails to deliver regeneration of the town centre and riverside and so the Plan must include sufficient comfort that this will happen.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1876  Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1) Paragraph 4.6.1 refers to the Guildford Borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan which we considered at the previous Regulation 19 consultation in 2016.

2) Policy ID1(1) has clearly been carefully reworded to act as a handbrake on development, but the NPPF test to hold back development is calibrated on the basis of Severe Impact. It is not clear that Guildford Borough Council’s approach is defensible and it is likely the course of development would be uncertain and unpredictable. For a plan to set out to be uncertain and unpredictable suggests to the Guildford Society either a gambler’s game of chance or negligence towards the borough and its current and future residents.

3) So much of our infrastructure is a legacy of past failures over several decades. Development controls, such as Section 106 Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy, are typically intended to mitigate incremental impacts of development and not to have to fix past issues. Policy ID1(2) may not be lawfully enforceable by planning condition or planning obligation due to, at least in part, the need to fix historic problems.

4) Policy ID1(4) refers to the criticality of infrastructure listed in Appendix C, which has been changed for the most part to require developers to fund in full many elements. There is no indication of the impact on other parts of the plan if individual developers demonstrate that they cannot or will not finance infrastructure.

5) At 4.6.2 we agree the use of the Planning Act 2008 definition of infrastructure. We also think that the Town Centre and District and Local Centres should be listed as core infrastructure for the community, area and Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6182  Respondent: 8562273 / The Clandon Society (Christopher Dean)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY II - Infrastructure and delivery

We object to this policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the Plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this Plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the Plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local Plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This Plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. Implementation is critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the Plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1653</th>
<th>Respondent: 8562273 / The Clandon Society (Christopher Dean)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy I1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. Much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support developments and for this to be in place as needed (listed in App. C to the Plan). Even if this happens the Plan admits …”we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and also that congestion at junctions will increase (but this is not modelled so we don’t know by how much or where).

The cumulative effects of the developments in the north east of Guildford are certain to have a devastating impact on the A247 through West Clandon (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposals in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate this impact. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and it is well known that they have no money available.

The Plan now calls for nearly all the proposed infrastructure to be funded by developers (see C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash required to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

All of these developments will draw very large amounts of additional traffic to the A247 through the village and there is no reference to this in the Plan. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to Gosden Hill schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel south and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the south and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)
- SCC’s business plan for Newlands Corner

We point out that although the A247 is classified as an A road it has none of the characteristics and ideally should be downgraded. The road is a well-known problem and a number of domestic planning applications have been turned down on highways objections. It is quite unsatisfactory to even consider putting more traffic on a road that:

- is less than 2 vehicles wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several very sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor sight lines
- has many properties with very poor exit sight lines
- has a very difficult and dangerous junction with the station access road
- has a dangerous junction with the southbound A3 on-slip road
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

In summary, the A247 is quite unsuited to coping with additional traffic and it is very clear that the developments proposed in the 2017 Local Plan will increase the amount of traffic on this road over and above that in the 2016 draft to which residents strongly objected. There is nothing in the Infrastructure Schedule which addresses this issue. Indeed several of the infrastructure proposals will themselves lead to significant increases in traffic on the A247.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16302</th>
<th>Respondent: 8562561 / Mrs C Sheard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17445</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563201 / West Horsley Parish Council (Sam Pinder)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II – Infrastructure and delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHPC view: Objects strongly

In brief: No detailed Infrastructure proposals for the Horsleys are presented, even in response to Thames Water’s statement that their current facilities would not have the capacity to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3

These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport for new developments. Whilst WHPC supports the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough or lack of for the Horsleys, which are the real issue.

WHPC believes there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today. The aggressive house building policy advanced by GBC in the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan will substantially exacerbate many, if not all, problem areas.

WHPC puts forward the following specific comments regarding infrastructure in West Horsley today:

- Thames Water has sent very clear advice in 2014 to stating that their current facilities, i.e. pipelines to the Ripley North Treatment Works and the Treatment Works, are unlikely to have the capacity to cope with one or possibly all the developments proposed for West and East Horsley. A 2 to 3 year lead-in period Thames Water say will be necessary to expand capacity following the granting of planning permission for a development Site.
- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic along the B2039.
- Principal through roads traversing West Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “West Horsley has lanes, not roads.” West Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic.
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in extremely poor condition, giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains. The southern edge of the Horsleys Area lies on the ‘spring line’ at the foot of the North Downs and is recognised in the GBC Infrastructure Delivery document as a Surface Water Flooding Hot Spot, viz:
  
  Surface Water Flooding Hot Spots Map â€“ Horsleys (extracted from GBC Infrastructure Delivery document page 22)
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or disabled persons in wheelchairs.
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking.
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.
It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

In respect of West Horsley, there are only four proposals mentioned in Appendix C:

LRN 22 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.

SANG 8 – Strategic Alternative Natural Green Space, Long Reach Farm, West Horsley. Years 1-5. Delivered by Landowner at cost of £7,573,822 from Developer contributions. NOTE: Long Reach Farm does not appear on any map.

WHPC Comment: SANG 8 would result, if granted permission, in the loss of open agricultural land in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The land contributes greatly to the openness of the Green Belt.

SANG 9 – Bespoke Strategic Alternative Natural Green Space, Ben’s Wood, West Horsley. Years 1-5. Delivery by Developer with Developer contributions.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example drainage, roads, pavements and schools.

Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in West Horsley itself and nearby, in East Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put enormous strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, WHPC submits this needs to be done much earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for West and East Horsley which, if taken together, would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that today are served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggests that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan to provide for any more school places in the Horsleys.

WHPC submits that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure, never mind GBC’s proposed growth in housing, is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan. The Plan is therefore UNSOUND.

WHPC OBJECTS to the lack of detailed infrastructure proposals to not only cater for development in West and East Horsley but also throughout the Borough. As drafted the proposals do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  WHPC Draft Local Plan response July 2016.pdf (2.2 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17497  Respondent: 8563201 / West Horsley Parish Council (Sam Pinder)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICIES 11, 12 & 13

These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport for new developments. Whilst WHPC supports the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough or lack of for the Horsleys, which are the real issue.

WHPC believes there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today. The aggressive house building policy advanced by GBC in the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan will substantially exacerbate many, if not all, problem areas.

WHPC puts forward the following specific comments regarding infrastructure in West Horsley today:

- Thames Water has sent very clear advice in 2014 to stating that their current facilities, i.e. pipelines to the Ripley North Treatment Works and the Treatment Works, are unlikely to have the capacity to cope with one or possibly all the developments proposed for West and East Horsley. A 2 to 3 year lead-in period Thames Water say will be necessary to expand capacity following the granting of planning permission for a development Site.
- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic along the B2039.
- Principal through roads traversing West Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “West Horsley has lanes, not roads.” West Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic.
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in extremely poor condition, giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains. The southern edge of the Horsleys Area lies on the ‘spring line’ at the foot of the North Downs and is recognised in the GBC Infrastructure Delivery document as a Surface Water Flooding Hot Spot, viz:

Surface Water Flooding Hot Spots Map â€“ Horsleys (extracted from GBC Infrastructure Delivery document page 22)

- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or disabled persons in wheelchairs.
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

In respect of West Horsley, there are only four proposals mentioned in Appendix C:

LRN 22 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.

SANG 8 – Strategic Alternative Natural Green Space, Long Reach Farm, West Horsley. Years 1-5. Delivered by Landowner at cost of £7,573,822 from Developer contributions. NOTE: Long Reach Farm does not appear on any map. WHPC Comment: SANG 8 would result, if granted permission, in the loss of open agricultural land in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The land contributes greatly to the openness of the Green Belt.
SANG 9 – Bespoke Strategic Alternative Natural Green Space, Ben’s Wood, West Horsley. Years 1-5. Delivery by Developer with Developer contributions.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example drainage, roads, pavements and schools.

Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in West Horsley itself and nearby, in East Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put enormous strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, WHPC submits this needs to be done much earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for West and East Horsley which, if taken together, would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that today are served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggests that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan to provide for any more school places in the Horsleys.

WHPC submits that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure, never mind GBC’s proposed growth in housing, is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan. The Plan is therefore UNSOUND.

WHPC OBJECTS to the lack of detailed infrastructure proposals to not only cater for development in West and East Horsley but also throughout the Borough. As drafted the proposals do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  WHPC Draft Local Plan response July 2016.pdf (2.2 MB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy No. and title</th>
<th>2016 WHPC position</th>
<th>2016 WHPC comment in brief</th>
<th>2017 WHPC position</th>
<th>2017 WHPC comment in brief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I1 – Infrastructure and delivery</td>
<td>Objects strongly</td>
<td>No detailed Infrastructure proposals for the Horsleys are presented, even in response to Thames Waters statement that their current facilities would not have the capacity to cope</td>
<td>Policy now ID1</td>
<td>Though requirements in the policy statement have been extended and will give, it is thought, better control, WHPC still does not see any detailed infrastructure proposals for the West Horsley housing developments planned to be built by 2024. No approach has been made to WHPC to discuss / identify what will be required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7455</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563777 / Michael Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The infrastructure is already overloaded, local schools are full and the waiting times to see a doctor getting longer. The impact on the parking at the local shops is going to be no one will be able to park with an extra 1000 plus cars on the local roads.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18656</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563777 / Michael Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roads are looking like a third world country as it is, potholes everywhere</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/376</th>
<th>Respondent: 8565153 / Mr David Gianotti</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am disgusted that such a proposal should be put forward when the existing local infrastructure (i.e. roads, water supply, doctors, schools and hospitals) is already struggling to cope. When I moved to Ripley some 17 years ago I came because I wanted to live in a pretty, green and quite environment, please tell me who I should look in the eye and ask why would you want to take this away and destroy our &quot;green and pleasant land&quot;?.......</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack of road and rail capacity

We object to this scale of growth when there is already insufficient road and railway capacity in Guildford. Locally, one effect of this level of growth (together with that in Waverley) will be to place an undue burden on the single-track lanes in the Tyting area, which is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Additional traffic will be very unwelcome and change the character of the AONB.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Traffic implications for the Tyting area

The lanes of the Surrey Hills are only suited to carrying a low level of traffic, often being narrow single track roads, as is the case for Halfpenny Lane and White Lane/Guildford Lane in the Tyting area.

The combination of the scale of growth proposed in this 2017 plan and a reduction of capacity in the town centre (as indicated by the plans for the Sustainable Movement Corridor and the Town Centre Regeneration Strategy) threatens to lead to much more peak hour traffic on minor roads around the town as drivers find alternatives routes.

This potential impact on the lanes should be avoided and the character of the lanes protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
land. We believe that a clear statement is required to understand whether the policies in the existing 2003 Local Plan will apply under such circumstances or whether the new policies proposed in this document will apply.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3165  **Respondent:** 8568193 / Miss Edwina Attwood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9.I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages already suffer from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on local roads.

Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, West Clandon included, already suffer from traffic congestion. Development around these villages will result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become ever popular, particularly at weekends with hundreds of cyclists passing through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements, as they often need to.

10.I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being significant for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send, will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is not sustainable.

There is no provision for the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: psp171/1427  Respondent: 8569857 / Woking Borough Council (Ernest Amoako)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Woking Borough Council will be concerned if there are any unmitigated traffic implications of the development proposals in the Guildford Local Plan that would have adverse impacts in the Borough. The development of some of the strategic sites identified in the Local Plan such as the Former Wisley Airfield would potentially have significant traffic implications in Woking if the impacts are not addressed. The implications of developing the proposals in the Plan on the road network such as the A3 corridor would be severe if appropriate mitigation is not identified and delivered as part of developing the sites. Appendix C of the Local Plan sets out the transport infrastructure projects identified to support the delivery of the Plan. This includes a number of projects to improve the A3 corridor and other road networks with indicative costings and funding sources. Woking Borough Council is aware that Highways England is still in the process of testing various options for A3 corridor improvements. The outcome of this work is not yet known. It is expected that the outcome of the work will be reflected in the Local Plan and if necessary used to refine the projects set out in Appendix C. Any adverse impacts should be appropriately addressed to ensure the sustainable delivery of the Local Plan without exacerbating the existing traffic conditions in Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2200  Respondent: 8570273 / Fiona Curtis  Agent: Fiona Curtis

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery.

Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services. The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value. The policy wording...
says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem. The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this

Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem. The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this
Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5..indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton. The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”.

Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch

By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable. The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints. The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model. Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods. Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan. The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network. It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below. In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5..indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton. The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”.

Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the...
existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided. The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR: Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road / Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3). Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8). Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14). Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction. Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction). Slyfield – there are no remarks relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane. Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attacht documents: Independent Traffic report annex 3.pdf (2.5 MB)
account, such as Dunsfold Park, which may have significant consequences for Guildford, as was pointed out by SCC and GBC in their submissions to Waverley in response to that planning application. The trip rates used in the forecast assume a level of public transport use and an appropriate level of bus services.

B

On the evidence provided by the SHAR based on the 2031 traffic forecasts using the SCC traffic model, congestion will be widespread in peak periods across much of the highway network, including on strategic routes. The A3 and M25 are forecast to be at or over capacity. The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highways schemes in place. Interpreting the model results is not straightforward, as was pointed out in response to the 2016 consultation. Table 4.12 is significant – showing the roads with the ten largest ratios of flow to capacity for Scenario 3, which includes all the planned development but not the major strategic route improvements on the A3 and M25. There is no equivalent for Scenario 5 (i.e. with the strategic improvements), but we can infer that all the roads in Table 4.12 will be at or over capacity in Scenario 5.

C

With regard to the comments on Policy A6: North Street redevelopment (page 9), the model used for the Strategic Highway Assessment is not sufficiently detailed to provide a satisfactory assessment of conditions on the town centre road network. This has been recognised by GBC and has led to the commissioning of more detailed analysis using a simulation model. Added to which, there is uncertainty over the highway capacity implications of the Sustainable Movement Corridor in the town centre and possible changes to the town centre gyratory, as discussed in the draft Town Centre Regeneration Strategy, which indicates that the intention is to reduce the capacity of the town centre network. The experimental closure of Walnut Tree Close is already being planned. Taking into account the demand forecast on the A281, the A322 and A31 in Table 4.12, the consequences of such a reduction will be far-reaching and must be accounted for.

D

Policy A26: Blackwell Farm has been amended and now the proposed development includes a secondary school with up to six form entry. This will add to morning peak hour traffic which was not included in the 2016 modelling. The SHAR findings indicate that there will be congestion in peak periods on the network that will serve this development. The A3 will be at or over capacity which means that the network will lack resilience, as it does today. The roads connecting to the town centre will continue to be under pressure. The SMC concept is more advanced on this section than elsewhere, but the effect on capacity has yet to be established. There will be queuing on the A31 on the approach to the new signalised junction that will give access to the Blackwell Farm site. The A31 is regarded as a key route by the LEP and LA partners.

E

The improvement to the A3 is obviously critically important to the Gosden Hill Farm development. We do not have the benefit of analysis of the proposed new slip roads giving access off and on to the A3 S–bound carriageway, nor an understanding of the implications of the SMC for the allocation of highway capacity on the local roads. What is self-evident is that the pressure on local roads in Burpham is already intense in peak periods, and these roads are not suited to carrying large volumes of traffic. Under the plan, congestion is very likely to be worse than today. The proposed Policy A24 Slyfield development will also add demand to the A320 and roads in Jacob’s Well.
The change to Policy A29: Land to the south and east of Ash and Tongham involving more houses means that there will be more traffic locally. While this will not be ‘major’ in terms of the borough as a whole, it will be significant locally. Ash and its surroundings will be impacted by the large Wellesley expansion in Aldershot. It is not clear to what extent the modelling reported in the SHAR allowed for this development. The pressure on the A331 and the roads connecting Aldershot to Guildford and Woking will increase.

The M25 is forecast to be at capacity after the planned improvements have been introduced, as shown both in the SHAR and also in the recently published DfT/HE report on the South West Quadrant. This is relevant to Policy A35 Wisley airfield. It should be noted that RHS Wisley is expanding its facilities with the aim of significantly increasing visitor numbers. The DfT/HE Stage 3 report concludes that the focus should not be on widening the existing road further beyond currently planned schemes but on how to reduce pressures and provide parallel capacity to relieve this part of the network. If the M25 and A3 are at capacity, then the Wisley development will add pressure on local roads that are not well-suited to carrying higher volumes of traffic. This is also relevant to the proposed developments at Burnt Common. The consequences for Ripley are likely to be serious. It is noted that Policy A35 now includes a requirement for mitigation of impacts in Ripley and on surrounding roads, which goes some way to recognising that there will be a problem.

A comprehensive up-to-date analysis is required to inform decision-making. This should include analysis of the mid-term stage of the plan, before the A3 improvement is complete, as well as 2034.

B
Section 2 Surface access to airports. The problem is that the improved A3 will be at or over capacity in peak periods under the Plan, and the M25 SW Quadrant study has concluded that the M25 will be overloaded. So surface access to Heathrow from Guildford will continue to be affected by the weaknesses listed in this section. The unofficial East–West route south of Guildford is the B3000 and traffic counts and air quality stats show that the route is over capacity at peak times and close to capacity at all times during the working day. Links permitting travel East–West must be addressed especially if benefits of the proximity to both Heathrow and Gatwick are to be realized. C Rail. This section is welcome. However, it is noted that Crossrail 2 has not yet been secured.

D
Strategic roads. Surely the strategy should be aligned with the position of Highs England set out in the Topic Paper: Transport, where it is evident that the improvement of the A3 will not be completed until 2026/27, or even 2027/28? The removal of schemes SRN1 and SRN6 from the list of key infrastructure for the plan, and redesignating them as ‘aspirational’ is inconsistent with the safety objectives of the borough and surely of Highways England and Surrey County Council (the highway authority). Under the strategy and the Plan, the issues for Beechcroft Drive and the weaving and merging issues on the existing A3 will not be addressed until half way through the plan period.
Section 5 Local roads. While welcoming the aspiration to transform the town centre, the traffic implications have not been dealt with in the strategy or the Plan. Section 1 correctly included the issue of “severance of the town and its constituent neighbourhoods resulting from a combination of the A3 trunk road, railway lines and the River Wey”. The case for a new crossing of the river and railway relieving pressure on the Farnham Road railway bridge should be taken very seriously and examined in depth. There is a real risk that a significant reduction in capacity in the town centre, both the gyratory and Walnut Tree Close, and on routes carrying the SMC, will lead to road users transferring to minor roads around the town that are unsuited to carrying more traffic. Detailed analysis is needed to assess the impact of changes in the town and development outside the town on the network as a whole. I appreciate that the task is huge but it is necessary. Prevention of traffic issues has to be better than trying to cure them afterwards?

F

The M25 SW Quadrant study report recommends that alternative routes are developed to carry orbital traffic, and this could mean more use of the A31/A331 in Guildford. There are local roads where capacity is already an issue and planned growth will add to problems that are not mentioned in this strategy. The scope of this element of the strategy is not wide enough.

G

The bus transit strategy is welcome. However, there is insufficient information on the Sustainable Movement Corridor to gauge either what it might deliver and its potential impact on road capacity. A high quality bus station in the town centre is critical for the future of the town. There is a lack of park and ride on the east of the town and not even an aspiration for future provision.

H

The active modes strategy is welcome. However, many roads in the borough are two-lane carriageways of restricted width, with little scope for allocating space for cyclists, and this has to be either accepted or addressed over the long term.

I

Section 6 Air quality. If traffic is going to increase in aggregate, as the forecasts show, even with the measures being proposed, then air quality will continue to be a concern. The Aecom paper states that Guildford is not in need of an AQMA, but officers and councilors know that this is not true as a site on the B3000 has exceeded EU legal limits for NO2 since monitoring began in 2013. The point has been reached where ‘further monitoring’ or further delay tactics cannot go on and an AQMA must be implemented in order to form a plan of action.

J

Section 7 Road safety. The proposals are welcome, but as stated above, the schemes SRN1 and SRN6 should be reinstated in the Plan for safety reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Paper: Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. This is a helpful paper providing context and background to the transport aspects of the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The fact the new supplementary technical work is planned to be carried out prior to the submission of the plan to the Secretary of State (para 3.18) is welcome, but just as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object -- this paper is in its infancy and lacks enough detail to support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


he needs to see this to make an informed decision, so do we, it would have been better if the results had been available for this consultation.

3. It is recommended that the wider evidence base should be expanded to include the following:

- Local Enterprise Partnerships and Local authorities: Influencing Strategic Transport in the South East, WSP, 2016
- Surrey County Council: Response to Waverley borough Council on WA/15/2395 Dunsfold Park, Dec 2016
- Guildford Borough Council: Guildford Town Centre Highway assessment –Town Centre Highway Layout Concept Testing, WSP, April 2016
- Comprehensive traffic modeling using new software
- Inclusion of other expert evidence ie RGP transport note on the A31 junction, The Landscape Assessment produced for Blackwell Farm and the review of the SHMA by Richard Bate (2016) and Neil MacDonald 2017.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/185  Respondent: 8571617 / Gordon & Jane Farquharson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Even taking account of all the proposals in the 2017 Plan, congestion which is already severe is set to get worse over the plan period. Whilst there are expressions like “modal shift” in transport being the solution to the problem. However, the is no clarity about how on earth this is to be achieved. I would have expected to see the necessary radical solutions like mega park & rides at Gosden Hill Farm, and towards Elstead, with a high-tech automated transport solution to the town and Research Park (such as autonomous PODS on an elevated track).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16194  Respondent: 8573505 / Anthony & Hazel Teal  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

If implemented they would have a dramatic and devastating effect on Guildford and destroy many of the fine aspects that make the town and its immediate environs such a good place to live, work and bring up a family. One of us has been a resident since 1960. While change is inevitable and must be accepted in a controlled, logical and sustainable fashion, this
plan provides too much land for development. Further it does not do enough to tackle a major blight on our community, traffic congestion. This is strangling the life out of our communities. Ultimately the appropriate and essential long term infrastructure must be decided upon and put in place first.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

83. I have commented at length on the failings of the Strategic Highway Assessment Report. The full impacts of traffic generated by this Plan have not been recognised and so the highway development proposals are inadequate. It would lead to a need for new roads through the countryside (including the AONB), road-widening and enlargement of junctions including within residential areas, and may require compulsory purchase and demolition of existing buildings some of which may be of historic interest or local character. The cost in financial and environmental terms would be immense and the alternative scenario of greatly increased congestion, unacceptable levels of local air pollution, and deterrent to business and visitors, is likely to persist well into the future affecting future generations as well as current residents and businesses.

84. Much of the infrastructure required is outside the control of Guildford Borough Council in relation to funding, timing and design. The schedule of proposals gives little detail and very broad brush estimates of cost suggesting that little detailed thought has gone into the requirements.

85. As elsewhere in the Plan this policy includes weak wording such as “should” and the “Reasoned justification” suggests (at 4.6.8) that the Council will be prepared to negotiate on infrastructure requirements – implying that significant developments may be delivered without the required infrastructure.

86. Guildford Borough Council should have applied a very significant constraint on the housing number but has refused to do so.

87. The highway aspects of the Infrastructure Development Plan were developed using hotspots identified in “OGSTAR” (the previous Transport Assessment used for the 2014 consultation) as a starting point. However, the site list used for OGSTAR was not even compatible with the former draft Local Plan let alone the current one. Despite this, the Key Evidence mentions the June 2016 Highway Assessment but not OGSTAR. Key developments such as Garlick’s Arch, added at a late stage, are not included the Highway Assessment.

88. I have not investigated other infrastructure requirements in any detail but I do have concerns that over-development in the south-east, including Guildford, will lead to serious water shortages in the near future. The solutions could be very expensive and damaging to the environment. It is only a few years ago that the water table was severely depleted and this is more likely to be repeated as over-development continues.

89. Monitoring should be concerned with delivery and any change in infrastructure adequacy rather than CIL receipts.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The wording has been amended to give an impression that provision of adequate infrastructure will be enforced. However, the reality is that GBC will not determine the required infrastructure. It will be determined by Surrey Highways for the local road network and they are required to support development – not put obstacles in the way. If the SHAR (2016) and its predecessor are anything to go by, the requirements will be understated or not even recognised. Transport assessments supporting planning applications will be prepared by consultants acting for, and remunerated by, the applicant. Improvements to the strategic road network (e.g. A3) will be determined by Highways England, budget constraints, and ministerial decisions.

A lead Councillor has stated that the proposed Blackwell Farm development will not depend on A3 widening (in response to a question put to the Executive Advisory Board meeting held on 20 April 2017). It seems likely that Highways England have felt the need to offer a reality check on the likelihood of major work on the A3, such as widening or a tunnel, in the foreseeable future – apart from improvements to two slip roads.

The policy states that infrastructure will be secured by planning condition and/or planning obligation but this will require enforcement and I doubt the ability and willingness of GBC to overcome developers’ viability arguments. For the permissions that require a longer timescale there could be non-delivery issues if the original developer abandons the project without fulfilling all the conditions and obligations. Item 4.6.8 still indicates that GBC will be prepared to reduce infrastructure requirements by negotiation; i.e. viability for the developer will take precedence over infrastructure.

No change has been made to the monitoring requirement which is based on CIL receipts and spending alone. This is not sufficient. The actual delivery of specified infrastructure, before a particular development takes place, should be monitored and enforced.

The Transport Topic Paper and associated letters from Highways England suggest to me that further modelling will be undertaken before the Examination and it also seems unlikely that it will be consulted on. I consider that any further modelling should include more detailed information than SHAR (2016) so that it can be subject to scrutiny by GBC and by the public under a consultation process. Failure to do this will further undermine the credibility of the evidence gathering process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
3. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16193  Respondent: 8574881 / Melanie McLaren  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5960  Respondent: 8575585 / Ian Macpherson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery

The issue of funding is supported in principle.

HOWEVER I am not at all clear how the issue of town centre infrastructure fits into this Local Plan. LRNI gives a listing of sorts, but no more.

Where is a consistent plan for the non-railway activities of the Railway Station? Surely here there should be some statement of policy related to transport interchange and its relationship with the town centre.

There is potentiall y a very major opportunity, more particularly because the owner of the 'Casino' building adjacent to Bridge Street is reportedly very interested in redevelopment also. The total site - Cinema, ground level car park, 'Casino: is of some significance in itself More importantly, it bridges between the Railway Station and The Friary, which is an entry point to the town centre as a whole.

Decades ago, the then planners identified the need for a high level route from the Station Overbridge to the Friary Centre, removing the pedestrian problems of Bridge Street and the at-level-lights crossing of Onslow Street { which current leading proposals fail to do}. The opportunity to have a

high level platform of size enough to be an attraction in its own right [ shops, entertainment, and the luxury hotel that Guildford so badly needs] while providing a most attractive route into town [ in contrast to so many walkways], is unique and should be seized. That does not emerge here.

The various proposals for the gyratory presumabl y will go outfor consultation in another document. But it has to be said that the present favoured packages are unhelpful. The closing of Bridge Street to vehicles does nothing to tackle the Onslow Street Crossing, or open up the river, while reducing the capacity of the road system [ from where I live, any
journey going North, eg Woking or the M 25, will be greatly handicapped]. The same result in terms of pedestrian safety can be achieved by reducing Bridge Street to two lanes [a solution that was accidentally trialled when building work was recently undertaken], and it is uncertain why anyone should see Bridge Street [which is pretty tatty] as a prime candidate for full pedestrianisation. The visionary solution must be the high level platform!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7030  Respondent: 8575617 / Effingham Parish Council (Ian Symes)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

II Infrastructure–Infrastructure and delivery

Support

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3630  Respondent: 8575649 / Ian Reeves  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Send, Send Marsh and Ripley must be protected from the increasing pressures on our Green Belt, Roads, Surgeries, Schools, Local Amenities and the health and welfare of existing residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/287  Respondent: 8577729 / Ripley Court Educational Trust (Mr Andrew Gough)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of information on how additional medical services would be provided.
2. I object to the lack of information on how the very limited infrastructure improvements proposed would cope with the new housing developments. The A3 interchange at Burnt Common would provide little or no traffic alleviation, and the A23 is currently suffering almost daily tailbacks on the current traffic load.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/1245  Respondent: 8579233 / Mrs Purrett  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the fact that the plans show no immediate provision for new schools, doctors' surgeries and ancillary needs. The infrastructure should be in place before any future development transpires.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/18725  Respondent: 8581089 / Jenny Wicks  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Policy II

Much of the infrastructure in Guildford Borough is already overstretched. Developments in villages will not be large enough to bring any significant infrastructure and so adding to housing in villages such as the Horsleys (where there is inclusion of a small, £1m, road improvement scheme of unknown financing and no detail) will only add to existing pressures. The local road network, at least in the east of the Borough, has not been given adequate consideration. Nor have the effects of village developments on schools and medical facilities.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/17568  Respondent: 8581505 / Burpham Neighbourhood Forum (Jim Allen)  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The wording is weak, in this policy. The first line text “..., Infrastructure needed to support development should be provided........” needs re-wording to read ‘........Infrastructure needed to support development MUST be provided........’.

In respect of CIL in Burpham and other Neighbourhood Plan areas it is a requirement that 25% of the CIL is allotted to the Ward or Parish, whilst non Neighbourhood Plan areas get only 15%. Therefore the third paragraph is incorrect in its terminology and definition.

In the last paragraph it implies that the Thames Basin is the ‘be all and end all of legal responsibilities’. In fact air pollution and noise pollution are also legal responsibilities of GBC.
This must be re-worded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2237  Respondent: 8581505 / Burpham Neighbourhood Forum (Jim Allen)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4.6.7
Within the Policy please clarify relationship between Parish and Neighbourhood Forum for CIL.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13955  Respondent: 8581601 / Mr James Winborn  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

the scale of additional development proposed for East and West Horsley, particularly West Horsley, will of course only add to the infrastructure problems outlined above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4348  Respondent: 8581889 / Joan Barnett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object strongly to Guildford Borough Council's Draft Local Plan June 2016.

I support all objections, reservations and relevant comments submitted by Burpham Community Association with regard to the Draft Local Plan and the devastating affect it will have on Burpham.

Adding another 2000 houses will double the size of Burpham without sufficient consideration to the infrastructure and traffic which will cause more air pollution

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large
infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13504</th>
<th>Respondent: 8582977 / Guildford Environment Forum (John Bannister)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6623  Respondent: 8585697 / Laurence Edwards  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure and Delivery OBJECT unless the following amendments are made:

1st paragraph Delete – “and available when 1st needed to serve the occupants and users of the development” and replace with “prior to the development being first occupied.”

3rd paragraph – 2nd line – delete the word “most”.

Comment – The Infrastructure schedule is not adequate to deliver the appropriate level of mitigation and infrastructure improvement needed to support the level of proposed development contained within the Local Plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15878  Respondent: 8586369 / Mr Luigi Fort  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Strategic Highway Assessment report (2016) sets out that in respect of the development proposed in the Local Plan, without any mitigation, the greatest potential impacts are seen on the network in the vicinity of Ash / Ash Vale and travelling north into the borough of Surrey Heath. Some of the trips in Ash / Ash Vale will join the A331 Blackwater Valley Road to travel further afield, but it is likely that a reasonable proportion will travel into the neighbouring boroughs of Rushmoor and Surrey Heath. Some of these roads already experience congestion, despite the model suggesting that existing traffic flows are relatively low.

Policy I1 (Infrastructure and delivery) of the draft Plan requires the infrastructure needed to support development to be provided and available when first needed to serve the occupants and users of the development. Infrastructure includes parks, green spaces and play areas, roads and other transport, schools, flood defences, sporting and recreational facilities, and medical facilities. Policy I3 deals with sustainable transport for new developments, and seeks to ensure that new developments will contribute to the delivery of an integrated, accessible and safe transport system.

Specifically of interest to the strategic allocation around Ash and Tongham, further information on key infrastructure projects is provided at Appendix C of the draft Plan, in the Infrastructure Schedule. Infrastructure projects LRN9 through to LRN14 relate to improvements to traffic management and environmental improvements in and around Ash, Ash Vale and Tongham, to be funded through a combination of developer contributions and Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnership Local Growth Fund awards. For example, the schedule identifies LRN14, which is a junction improvement scheme at the connection of the A331 Blackwater Valley Route with the A31 Hog’s Back (Tongham). It is important to note that this mitigation is required to enable the development proposed in the Local Plan to proceed.

In this context, Rushmoor Borough Council is supportive of the planning policy framework and detailed infrastructure projects as they relate to the road network, subject to certainty regarding the delivery of these improvements as part of the overall package of implementation of development in and around Ash, Ash Vale and Tongham.

In addition, PED6 sets out a potential expansion of Ash Grange Primary School if required to provide spaces for the primary age children who will live in the new homes to the south and east of Ash and Tongham. These infrastructure proposals are supported by Rushmoor Council, mindful of the strategic allocation for residential development in and around the settlements of Ash and Tongham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/2293</th>
<th>Respondent: 8587105 / Linda Parker-Picken</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I consider that the Local Plan has given insufficient consideration to the overall traffic flows in the Send and Ripley/ Wisley A3/ M25 interchange areas as they would be affected by high increases in traffic volume caused by additional housing, employment and traveller allocations in both Send and at the nearby Wisley and Gosden Hill sites plus the A43a construction of new slip roads at Burnt Common. (transport)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8079</th>
<th>Respondent: 8587489 / University of Surrey (Malcolm Parry)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure Policies: The infrastructure policies are sensible. Policy I3 “Sustainable transport for new developments” and Policy I4 “Green and blue infrastructure” are important and I support each of them. Blackwell distinguishes itself in each of these areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2115</th>
<th>Respondent: 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery.

We would caution the premise here that the sole driver for ensuring the adequate supply of publically accessible green infrastructure is as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), required via the EU Birds Directive. This is not true and therefore misleading.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1257</th>
<th>Respondent: 8591169 / Michael Bruton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
k. I object that many of the sites proposed are in unsustainable locations as defined in the NPPF.

l. I object to the assumptions in the Plan which projects a major shift to cycling and walking. This is highly unlikely given the absence in the Plan of adequate safe cycling lanes/walking routes – especially in rural areas.

m. I object to the threat to relatively small villages of major housing developments. Such villages will be overwhelmed and will cease to be villages.

n. I object to any villages being ‘taken out of the Metropolitan Green Belt’. The MGB is meant to be a permanent and open feature in itself and protected forever and for future generations.

o. I object to the impact of excessive housing numbers in terms of increased traffic congestion on the M25/A3 and other A roads as well as on rural roads which are congested already and which will become even more used as ‘rat runs’ to the A roads. Small accidents already cause major hold ups on the A3/M25 in particular. There is no tolerance in the Plan for increased road accidents/road closures resulting from more traffic.

p. I object to a failure in the local plan to consider the impact of increased traffic on parking congestion both in Guildford and the villages.

q. I object to the failure to consider adequate protection in the Plan for heritage assets in both Guildford town, the villages and countryside.

r. I object to the failure in the Plan to consider environmental protection as a fundamental objective.

s. I object to the failure to consider in the Plan the impact of 693 homes per annum on Policing requirements/crime prevention.

t. I object to the failure to consider the impact in the Plan on local GP surgeries and increased difficulty in securing doctor appointments.

u. I object to the failure in the Plan to consider and plan for additional school places and how children will journey to these schools – especially at Three Farms Meadows in Ockham.

v. I object to the proposal to build 70% of new housing on the Green Belt which is supposed to be permanent countryside for existing and current generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy ID1 – Again, the strengthening of the need for infrastructure to precede or accompany development is excellent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT

Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The Council’s methodology assessing traffic and roads infrastructure needs is inadequate. It identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Welcome the Council’s commitment to provide the Infrastructure needed to support new development. We wish to bring to the Council’s attention land adjacent to the existing Artington Park and Ride, which could serve as an extension to the park and ride. Please refer to the accompanying covering letter and plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. Infrastructure – Transport (Policies I1, I2 and I3)
The words “Roads and Transport Infrastructure” are mentioned in Definitions under Policy I1 (Infrastructure and Delivery), but there are no detailed proposals for the Horsleys in any of the Local Plan documents, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This is extremely surprising, the more so when one reads Thames Water’s advice re its lack of capacity to deal with wastewater, given that the DLP proposes development in the Horsleys in years 1 to 5 of the Plan Period.
a) Infrastructure – Waste Water (Policy I1)
I object to the lack of coherent proposals relating to waste water infrastructure for the Horsleys.
Waste water infrastructure receives a mention in each of the A37 to A41 Site Reviews and in Reasoned Justification under Policy I1, but no detail for the Horsleys has been found in any of the Local Plan documents, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
There are known sewage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North / Green Lane area.
Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from one or all of the proposed developments. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley it is understood will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advises ‘a 2 to 3 years lead-in period’ to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development site is granted.
b) Policy I3 provides that developers “will be expected” to propose and secure travel plans for their developments and contribute to transport arrangements for the able and disabled. Legally, this is meaningless - this proposed policy lacks ‘teeth’ and is unrealistic where development and major housebuilding companies are involved.
c) Whilst Horsley station has frequent trains to London and Guildford seven days a week, the station car park is normally full on weekdays. An increase in village population will increase pressure on station parking and traffic movements to/from Horsley station, to drop off/collect travellers to London and school children going to Guildford and Leatherhead.
d) Infrastructure – Schools and Medical Facilities (Policy I1)
I object to the lack of coherent proposals relating to schools and medical facilities for the Horsleys.
There is a continuing lack of state primary school places in the Horsleys. The Raleigh School which serves both East and West Horsley is full every year and this has been the situation for many years. Secondary school places are limited in number at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools involve a much longer journey of time and distance from the Horsleys to reach them. Glensk and Cranmore private schools are well supported by many families living in Guildford and other villages up to 14 miles away. Each of these private schools during term time, receives high volumes of traffic going to and from each school at each end of the school day, on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively. Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, serving all of East and West Horsley and areas beyond, is always extremely busy and residents experience difficulty in making appointments. The planned population increase (in excess of Government ONS forecasts) for the borough will require a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to cope.
e) I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will give rise to super congestion in East Horsley, West Horsley, West Clandon, Ockham, Normandy, Ripley, Send and Worplesdon with no plans displayed or any stated intent to improve the non A roads. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and few have footpaths. 5000 plus houses in such a small area will spawn dangerous and unsustainable traffic growth.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2163</th>
<th>Respondent: 8597601 / St Catherines Village Association (Philip Mansley)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure: Strict application of the policy not to sanction any development which has infrastructure issues is vital. There is some scepticism about the policy and a belief that developers will be able to find ways of getting round these strictures. The Council must ensure that permission for development until road and other infrastructure is in place or guaranteed is not granted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1649</th>
<th>Respondent: 8597761 / Mrs Pippa Fleming</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I object to the impact that additional residents will have on local roads, health services, education spaces and policing needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I object to the failure of Guildford Borough Council to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 in the Local Plan and to find sufficient brownfield sites for development prior to considering sites within the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15580</th>
<th>Respondent: 8597793 / Pirbright Parish Council (Lindsay Graham)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy I1 Infrastructure and Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirbright Parish Council note the very extensive infrastructure requirements associated with the scale of development identified within the proposed Local Plan. It is essential that this infrastructure is delivered in a timely manner to support the development proposed, particularly where those locations are less than ideal at present in terms of their location or the availability of supporting services and infrastructure. Where improvements to rail services, roads, footpaths and cycleways cannot be secured in advance of the population that depend on such services, development should be restricted. In some cases this may mean the principle of development in some locations must be questioned where the roads or other infrastructure cannot be provided at a time and in a manner that can support sustainable living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are concerned that inadequate attention has been given to the effects of rural development in and around the villages of Pirbright, Worplesdon and Normandy on the infrastructure of the area, including schools, social infrastructure, sewers, water, roads and rail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We would note that this is particularly important in rural areas where there isn’t a network of safe cycleways and alternatives to car transport and where villages, such as Pirbright bear the impact of decisions elsewhere. We are concerned that allocations such as A46 and A47 Normandy and Flexford are not sustainably located and would object to the allocation. Even with the small range of services proposed as part of the proposed allocation, most of the new houses will be served by cars travelling to Guildford, Brookwood Station and other locations, imposing a burden on Pirbright and Worplesdon that exacerbates the existing traffic problems experienced by the rural areas. Although this is not as high profile as the congestion within Guildford, it must be recognised that the rural villages such as Pirbright are suffering increasing congestion and the adverse impact of traffic brought about by development (such as Deepcut, Pirbright Institute, Henley Park and now proposals at Normandy/Flexford) and other pressures. The junctions within and around Pirbright, including Fox Corner, Cemetery Pales and Pirbright Arch to Brookwood are under particular peak-hour stress. As the mainline service from Brookwood into London, the roads within the area will suffer further pressure with development to the west in Normandy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/5445</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8597825 / Mr P J Colborne-Baber</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure. Roads, schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals and public transport are all overstretched now let alone with the addition of all these new houses. Roads are busy especially at school times and HGVs of huge sizes use the roads as 'through' roads. Where are all the weight limit signs these days? That would prevent much of the damage that is occurring and save money. The schools are always full, both state and private. Doctors surgeries are always busy and look at the state of the Royal Surrey County Hospital in Guildford at present. Public transport, particularly the railways just now, are in an awful mess and buses don't really count as they are so few and far between.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp171/799</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8598785 / Mr Roger Parslow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/877  Respondent: 8599201 / Richard D Jarvis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The strengthening of conditionality in point (3) is supported.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2619  Respondent: 8601537 / Downsedge Residents' Association (Rosemary Morgan)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The new paragraph 2.10a stating that “Pressure on existing infrastructure and additional stress caused by planned growth must be addressed if we are to maintain and enhance the borough's prosperity and quality of life. Many people are attracted to Guildford by the quality of life and environment. This places a high demand on school places and access to amenities such as open spaces. The Local and Strategic road networks, rail network and local facilities in village settlements are also facing increasing pressure.” is to be commended but is not specific enough.

Downsedge RA is concerned that the traffic situation in and around Guildford is already at breaking point (e.g. the A3 regularly jams and results in substantial traffic flows through the town centre). The above paragraph states that “pressure on existing infrastructure and additional stress caused by planned growth must be addressed if we are to maintain……..” We would have preferred to see a statement such as “pressure on existing infrastructure and additional stress caused by planned growth will be addressed if we are to maintain……..”

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6364  Respondent: 8601793 / Roy Proctor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In addition I would observe that the existing infrastructure in the East and West Horsley area - in particular the roads and drainage - are not functioning in an acceptable manner at the present and the prospect of the addition of the potential number of houses in the villages and close by, with the addition of 2,000 at Ockham, 400 at Burnt Common and 2,000 at Gosden Hill Farm requires more than a passing reference to "traffic management" as a solution to the impractical
outcome of adding these large numbers of vehicles. I object to the strategic site proposals indicated and to the larger land areas within the villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11213  Respondent: 8602337 / Cross Group (Mr Colin Cross)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1 - Infrastructure and Delivery

I object to any development without the necessary strategic infrastructure being put in place prior to development. I object to developments not providing their planned peripheral infrastructure, i.e. schools, health centres as part of the development, prior to properties being sold.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/245  Respondent: 8602465 / Sallie Hair and Beauty (Ms Sallie Hone)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO THE 2016 DRAFT LOCAL.

I object to the following plans.

- Disproportionate amount of development in one area of the borough
- As an owner of a hair and beauty salon Parking is already a big problem and if people can't park they will not use the village
- Shops will become extinct
- Lack of immediate provision for schools and medical doctors as if both of those problems are not already present in Surrey ??

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7827  Respondent: 8605921 / Roger Lindsay  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

The attachment of large numbers of hoses at a high density to communities of completely different character so as to overwhelm the existing communities is not acceptable. Nor is it acceptable to be virtually silent on the infrastructure implications or the timing of providing properly sized infrastructure given that what is there now in terms of roads, lanes, schools, elderly care, medical facilities are already overloaded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17499  Respondent: 8607169 / CPRE Surrey Branch & Guildford District (Tim Harrold)
Agent: Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Infrastructure

CPRE objects at the failure to supply a satisfactory infrastructure strategy or delivery plan for Guildford in time for this consultation. In the Surrey Infrastructure Study of January 2016 the total infrastructure cost required was assessed to reach £1.162 billion. The total secured funding was given as £75.8 million and the total expected funding was estimated at £568.2 million. This left a funding gap of £518 million which is equivalent to 55% of the total costs budget. CPRE OBJECTION.

CPRE recognises that many major infrastructure decisions affecting Guildford District are outside the control of GBC and that this makes planning ahead for a long period almost impossible, especially at a time when the economic outlook is so uncertain and difficult to predict. Many decisions which can only be outlined as aspirations depend on infrastructure provision being agreed by Highways England (M25 and A3), Historic England, Natural England, Network Rail, the Surrey County Council, and Thames Water. The constraint of providing SANGS in connection with the Thames Basin Heaths has also to be taken into account.

GBC are making ambitious proposals for housing regardless of the lack of adequate infrastructure in support. Without this being provided before development is begun, there will be a real threat of intensified disruption caused by traffic congestion, particularly at peak times, in many communities. CPRE OBJECTION.

Surrey’s motorways already carry 80% more traffic than the average for the South East and our A roads 66% more than the national average. CPRE has been heavily concerned with traffic management issues across the county for many years. We have served on the M25 Orbit Committee and were involved with the consultation on the Hindhead tunnel, the Cobham Motorway Service Area and the Hard Shoulder Running Initiative for the M25 between Junctions 5 and 7. We have also been concerned for a prolonged period with the various AirTrack rail proposals linking Guildford and Woking to Heathrow which are now in abeyance. We expect to become involved in monitoring the North Downs rail proposal linking Reading to Gatwick via Guildford.

We think it unrealistic for Cross Rail 2 to be discussed at this continuing time of likely austerity as a means of freeing up the overburdened rail link to Waterloo from Guildford and Woking. We do have, however, to recognise the planning challenge that the high percentage of commuters travelling to London for work represents, together with a comparable number coming into both Guildford and Woking for daily employment. It is disheartening to see the inadequacy of the Solum proposal for Guildford’s mainline station which did not sufficiently address the issues that concern commuters or residents most. CPRE OBJECTION.

The detrimental impact of traffic congestion on quality of life across Surrey is a topic of importance to everyone. The location of schools and their school runs are of course a daily cause of traffic problems. The proposal for the Hoe Valley...
school and its associated Leisure and Sporting facilities will be on Green Belt land and will certainly not improve matters on the A320 at Mayford on the road between Guildford and Woking, even if Paragraph 89 of the NPPF allows for greater flexibility to be shown for outdoor sport and recreation within the Green Belt, as long as it does not conflict with its openness. The Woking Traffic Survey acknowledges that this proposed development will have a damaging effect on congestion on the A320 and A322 as well as other local roads. CPRE OBJECTION.

Congestion on A roads leads to the overuse of B roads by speeding traffic that exceeds the relevant limits which are invariably not enforced. The B367 from Ripley to Pyrford is an example of this problem. Speed limits for the Pyrford Conservation Area and elsewhere along this road are not observed except where traffic lights or the narrowness of the road itself, as at Newark lane in Ripley, slows traffic down.

Other roads such as the B380 serve as a link between the A324, the A322 and the A320 and all carry excessive traffic for their size. An example of a C road which is already under severe traffic pressure is Salt Box Road which forms the link between the A320 and the A322 as well as funnelling through traffic between the M3 and the A3. Burdenshot and Goose Rye Road are examples of D roads where safety is a major concern as traffic seeks to find a way through to Worplesdon where a new Park and Ride location is proposed. The question has to be asked in this context as to how this proposal can be considered given the Kemishford bridge access problem and the unsuitability of the bridge near the station at Prey Heath Road with its long history of flooding issues.

CPRE gives these examples of busy roads where house building on the scale envisaged for Guildford and Woking will only make traffic matters much worse. Further analysis is required in both boroughs of the impact of the huge housing projects proposed and the positioning of the school and park and ride facilities they envisage. CPRE OBJECTION.

CPRE questions whether all the development envisaged for Guildford can be considered sustainable and deliverable in the time required. Paying for all this investment will be very hard to achieve through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which is one of the motivating forces behind GBC’s attempt to accelerate passage of the draft Local Plan and use as much Green Belt land in the process as they can. CPRE again maintains that this approach is misguided as it places too much emphasis on economic priorities at the expense of environmental policies which have served the community well and need to be supported rather than undermined. CPRE OBJECTION.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1984  Respondent: 8607169 / CPRE Surrey Branch & Guildford District (Tim Harrold)
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

CPRE has seen the questionnaire response made by Richard Jarvis on Transport Infrastructure which we endorse with respect to the current plan process. Richard Jarvis is a former senior executive of Atkins with a great deal of experience in this sector. CPRE is confident that his judgement is based on fully up to date information and regular dialogue with those involved at GBC, SCC, and Highways England. He is a member of the Tyting Society Committee and the Guildford Residents Associations Coordination Committee. He is also in regular communication with the Guildford Vision group and the Guildford Society as well as CPRE.

CPRE is concerned with planning ahead in the longer term and wishes to make clear that this would involve safeguarding land for projects which are currently listed as aspirational such as a proposed A3 tunnel at Guildford.

CPRE was involved in a Committee dealing with Modal Shift and the M25 during the preparation of the former draft South East Plan. More focus should be given to this topic now with regard not only to Guildford’s current road traffic problems, both in town and countryside, but also its rail connections to Gatwick and it is to be hoped eventually Heathrow. The proposal to improve the North Downs line will involve a range of complicated issues regarding the
introduction of a surface rail electric supply, level crossings, pedestrian rights of way, bridge maintenance, noise disturbance and air pollution within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

We have been advised of an objection that is to be made by the Beechcroft Drive Residents Association at the omission of any reference in the draft plan to the removal of access for their road to the A3 (Ref SRN1 and SRN6). No alternative access route has yet been proposed. This would probably need to involve the use of a narrow lane running over University of Surrey land to the North which is located near ancient woodland within the Green Belt that is outside the urban area to the West. This topic has been on the agenda for resolution over many years and all stakeholders have recognized that the problem of A3 road access needs addressing, and is essential infrastructure for the Beechcroft Drive community. This is why this topic has always previously been included in the plan. In the CPRE view, it should not have been removed. There is in any case general concern about the whole safety aspect regarding Beechcroft Drive access to the A3 which is long overdue to be tackled. It is not just a question of safety for the residents of Beechcroft Drive but also the highway safety of all users of the A3 driving past this junction which is made dangerous by heavy road and HGV traffic with poor visibility speeding past a blind bend. There are more than 100 daily entries and exits into and out of Beechcroft Drive. The risk of a serious accident involving fast moving traffic is therefore repeated approximately 200 times a day. It is apparent that in these circumstances priority must be given to resolving this issue before a fatality occurs. CPRE would suggest that an on site visit is called for. This is not an “aspiration” matter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/106  Respondent: 8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This policy sounds a reasonable statement of intentions but like most residents groups in Guildford, WBDRA is concerned about the specifics and delivery of much need infrastructure improvements.

Most important of all are Roads and Drainage - what the Council Tax paying residents want is extensive improvements now not to wait until we've added another few hundred house to our already congested roads and overloaded (often overflowing sewage pipes/systems).

There have already been a number of major housing developments in Guildford Borough in the last few years yet no visible improvement to easing the traffic flow is in existence yet. Roads connecting new housing developments to existing roads DO NOT ease traffic flow.

Many parts of the borough experience routine flooding - a combination of (1) inadequate/overloaded drainage systems and (2) increased surface water run-off due to concreting over vast amounts of natural soakaway through the earth.

Several parts of the Borough routinely suffer overflowing sewage both in the streets and in homes (Fairlands Estate is one such example) as the existing pipework and sewage plant cannot cope. This type of Public Health issue must be addressed before even thinking of adding more house to the piped services

To sum up, Infrastructure improvements first please then the housing development can start.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1268  Respondent: 8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

WBDRA OBJECTS to this policy as it fails to make clear the pressing need to deliver Infrastructure improvements PRIOR to any further development taking place.

The policy needs redrafting to reflect the urgent requirement to enhance & improve the Borough's Infrastructure as a matter of urgency.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2395  Respondent: 8609217 / West Clandon Parish Council (John Stone)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I1 - Infrastructure and delivery

We object to this policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on
providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1) Our residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems.

2) Much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support developments and for this to be in place as needed (listed in App. C to the Plan). Even if this happens the Plan admits …“we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes”. This will be most acutely felt at junctions but these effects have apparently not been analysed so that we don’t know the location or impact.

3) We can be sure however that the cumulative effects of the developments in the North East of Guildford will have a devastating impact on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send). It is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposals in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate this impact. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and it is well known that they have no money available.

4) The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash required to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete.

5) If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

6) All of these developments will draw very large amounts of additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:
- children from elsewhere being delivered to Gosden Hill schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)
- SCC’s business plan for Newlands Corner

We point out that although the A247 is classified as an A road, it has none of the characteristics because it:
- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor sight lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- has a dangerous junction with the Southbound A3 on-slip road
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

In summary, the A247 is quite unsuited to coping with additional traffic and it is very clear that the developments proposed in the 2017 Local Plan will increase the amount of traffic on this road over and above that in the 2016 draft to which residents strongly objected. There is nothing in the Infrastructure Schedule which addresses this issue. Indeed, several of the infrastructure proposals will themselves lead to significant increases in traffic on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2.1 The most frequently expressed concern of residents within the parish is that the current traffic congestion is a major concern which will clearly only be increased by any further development. The A281 is regularly congested from Bramley to Guildford and the roundabout in Shalford where it is joined by the A248 is often congested back into Chilworth and Wonersh from the east and into Peasmarsh along the Broadford Road to the west. The fundamental issues here are:

- the inability of the gyratory system in Guildford to handle the volume of traffic entering and passing through this “gap” town; and
- the potential for bottlenecks created by junctions on major roads to the south of Guildford, such as the roundabouts at Shalford and Bramley and the junction at Rice’s Corner in Chilworth.

Recent and proposed major development in Waverley will only add to the problem with Guildford being a major employer for all these areas as well as a hub for entertainment and communication. We note that the traffic flows on A roads in Surrey already have 64% higher volumes than the UK averages and some roads are already operating beyond their design capacity.

2.2 We note that the Settlement Hierarchy (2014) document assessment of whether both Chilworth and Shalford are “well connected’ grades both villages as ‘poor or neutral’, and this certainly accords with views expressed by residents about the existing rail and local bus services.

2.3 We welcome the Infrastructure Policies within the Plan and in particular under Policy I1 the fact that “where the timely provision of necessary supporting infrastructure is not secured, development may be phased to reflect infrastructure delivery, or will be refused”. We remain concerned that funding from Highways England and SCC may be delayed or reduced and would re-iterate that the Transport Infrastructure is currently not adequate for the borough. We note with concern that there are no proposals to improve the A281 which is the main congested artery through the parish.

2.4 The other most frequently stated concern of residents is that any future development will increase the existing pressure which they already experience on schools, medical services and the utility providers. Whilst there may be availability at certain schools within Guildford Borough or its neighbours, this would result in an increased need to travel, with resulting further traffic congestion during school terms.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9827  **Respondent:** 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**General comments:**

Infrastructure must come first and the correct delivery sequence must be complied with. Worplesdon Parish Council supports development of the town centre (including Walnut Tree Close) which is a more sustainable location. There should be less retail and more residential development in the town centre providing the correct infrastructure is in place.

Following the precedent set by a nearby local planning authority, the parish council believes that all major developments must install all necessary infrastructure for the complete development at commencement.

Improved sewage works, enhanced transport infrastructure and improved air quality are a prerequisite to any future development.

Paragraph 3.6 of the Infrastructure Study is incorrect. The Hockford Sewage works have been omitted in error.
Locally the following infrastructure improvements would be required:

- Pedestrian facilities to meet proposed development, including a pedestrian crossing on the A323 near Hunts Farm.
- Improved cycling facilities throughout the parish and improved junctions to have the capacity to cater for existing and future traffic levels.
- Worplesdon Parish Council supports the upgrade of the pedestrian bridge between the railway station and the town to fully integrate the station with the town.
- Healthcare

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9858</th>
<th>Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II Infrastructure and Delivery**

OBJECT unless the following amendments are made:

1st paragraph Delete – “and available when 1st needed to serve the occupants and users of the development” and replace with “prior to the development being first occupied.”

3rd paragraph – 2nd line – delete the word “most”.

Comment – The Infrastructure schedule is not adequate to deliver the appropriate level of mitigation and infrastructure improvement needed to support the level of proposed development contained within the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/2494</th>
<th>Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECT unless the following amendments are made:

1st paragraph Delete – “and available when 1st needed to serve the occupants and users of the development” and replace with “prior to the development being first occupied.”

Comment – The Infrastructure schedule is not adequate to deliver the appropriate level of mitigation and infrastructure improvement needed to support the level of proposed development contained within the Local Plan.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1st paragraph Delete – “and available when 1st needed to serve the occupants and users of the development” and replace with “prior to the development being first occupied.”

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/465</th>
<th>Respondent: 8640353 / Julian Cranwell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery

Response

Summary

I OBJECT to this policy as it stands. Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The methodology commissioned by the Council to assess traffic and the corresponding roads infrastructure needs is inadequate for the purpose of the Local Plan and identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Under the growth proposed some locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. Even the A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

With regard to SANG provision, GBC has demonstrated that it has no genuine interest in conserving and enhancing biodiversity and clearly regards the Thames Basin Heaths SPA as an obstacle to be overcome rather than a valued asset. This is underlined at the end of the Policy wording which indicates that the council is more interested in meeting its legal responsibilities than actually protecting wildlife. GBC is failing to take account of existing biodiversity at sites selected for SANG provision.

Detailed response:

Some infrastructure, as identified in Figure 1 of the draft IDP- is within the control and remit of Guildford Borough Council – they have some influence in relation to planning – but much is under the control, and is the fiscal responsibility of, Surrey County Council or Highways England.
It is not realistic to assume that car use can effectively be replaced for all or even many users. Those who are disabled or infirm cannot easily substitute car journeys with bike travel: the elderly; the disabled; those caring for young children (particularly uncertain bike users and those with multiple children to care for); those wishing to use cars for supermarket or other bulky shopping; those who wish to commute to work and have no facilities for showering or changing on arrival; those who have lengthy and tiring commutes at present, for which the car is the final (short) element of a long journey (for those commuting into London from outside Guildford, a daily 3 hour commute is typical; this cannot realistically be extended by extensive cycling). All these factors mean that the replacement of the car with cycle use is likely to be overstated by many studies, particularly given narrow roads which do not allow effective or safe bike lanes.

Funding is not the only - nor the main - obstacle to improving infrastructure within the borough, and this seems not to be recognized. Guildford is a gap town, set in a bowl within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the south of the borough, and with large sections of the borough affected by the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area to the north. There is a ribbon through the middle of the borough which contains rail and road links to London, but is already heavily congested, is Green Belt, AONB, SPA or more than one of the above. Very little of the borough is available for extensive development of infrastructure or any building. Do we really want solutions that involve driving new roads through our remaining countryside – including the AONB – at huge cost in financial and environmental terms. Such solutions may be the only ones left when the inadequacies of this proposed Local Plan are realised after the event.

Policy indicates note an intention to pool Community Infrastructure Levy from most new build development and to use CIL receipts to assist in provision of infrastructure needed to support the delivery of the plan. As with other aspects of planning, there is a failure to recognize that out of town settlements in particular have particularly high requirements for additional new basic infrastructure in order to exist at all – roads, sewers, water provision, electricity, gas, telephone and broadband links will all need to be provided and in many cases the links to existing services will need to be upgraded before these can be implemented. The ability to divert funds from CIL to other uses will be inherently limited, not least that otherwise the proposed settlements will not be able to function. The Council strategy of taking CIL from new build in the Green Belt seems to be to pay for roads within the town centre, as indicated in the policy which notes that legislation prevents the use of planning obligations to fund existing infrastructure deficits.

In the reasoned justification, it is indicated that the council will be prepared to negotiate if an applicant claims that the infrastructure requirements for their development make it unviable. This means that some developments will go ahead anyway and worsen the infrastructure deficit. The Policy claims that infrastructure needed “should” be provided and available when first needed but I have no confidence in the council enforcing this.

The absolute constraint on developmental capacity within the borough represented by the infrastructure limitations cannot be swept aside, but the council has ignored this and failed to apply a constraint on the housing number.

I am not convinced that the extent of existing traffic congestion has been fully recognised by the SCC transport assessment because the methodology employed waters down the level of traffic observed. This has knock-on effects when modelling the various development scenarios. The result is that the requirements identified (expensive though they may seem) are the tip of the iceberg. One of the easiest issues to understand is the use of average peak hour flows for the baseline data. SCC acknowledge that that this is “typically lower” (see Transport Assessment 4.13.4 but GBC prefer the averaging approach with some eloquent wording in their Headline network metrics (3.9). A much better solution would have been to collect reliable baseline data that allowed for the effects of queuing and modelled each hour (or a shorter time period). Such an approach would have cost more but GBC seem unwilling to go the extra mile for reliable evidence while being content to spend large sums of money on propaganda exercises such as their one-sided video. There are other more technical reasons why the transport assessment methodology fails to fully identify current and planned congestion.

Planned developments for Guildford and Waverley Boroughs were modelled together but growth for the rest of the UK was allowed for only using the DoT forecasts. As a result it is not clear whether adequate allowance has been made for significant developments planned for Woking and other neighbouring Boroughs. This represents an inconsistency in approach with the West Surrey SHMA.
Many of the results for the PM peak are missing (TA 4.1.11 states that “these can be set out in an addendum report at a later date”). I believe that those who need to travel on the roads in peak hours will be every bit as interested in their future journeys home as they are for going to work. Publication of the Transport Assessment was delayed until the start of the consultation period so perhaps the non-inclusion of many PM results was simply a result of running out of time.

The Model Development Validation Report does include some interesting baseline data that may be of interest to residents in terms of local knowledge of traffic.

I am not convinced that it would be practical or desirable to end up in a position where the only solution to traffic congestion is to build many more new roads as by-passes through the Surrey countryside, or turn existing roads into dual carriageways, or demolish buildings (some of which may be historic) in order to accommodate higher capacity junctions in built-up areas.

It is noted that the infrastructure Development Plan was developed using hotspots identified in “OGSTAR” (the previous Transport Assessment used for the 2014 consultation) as a starting point. (See Transport Topic Paper (5.56)). However, the site list used for OGSTAR was not even compatible with the former draft Local Plan let alone the current one. Despite this, the Key Evidence mentions the June 2016 TA but not OGSTAR.

Appendix C (Infrastructure Schedule) is lacking in detail concerning what work will actually be carried out for most of the Local Road Network projects and the cost estimates are clearly at the guesswork stage suggesting that these schemes have not been fully thought through or checked for viability. If more detail is available then why not provide it.

It is not clear whether CIL will be received in time to put the required infrastructure in place for each development – or what penalties will be applied for late payment.

The Monitoring Indicators rely entirely on annual CIL receipts and spending. Surely they should look at actual infrastructure delivery and any changes in its adequacy.
justifying removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

With regard to SANG provision, GBC has demonstrated that it has no genuine interest in conserving and enhancing biodiversity and clearly regards the Thames Basin Heaths SPA as an obstacle to be overcome rather than a valued asset. This is underlined at the end of the Policy wording which indicates that the council is more interested in meeting its legal responsibilities than actually protecting wildlife. GBC is failing to take account of existing biodiversity at sites selected for SANG provision.

Some infrastructure, as identified in Figure 1 of the draft IDP- is within the control and remit of Guildford Borough Council – they have some influence in relation to planning – but much is under the control, and is the fiscal responsibility of, Surrey County Council or Highways England.

It is not realistic to assume that car use can effectively be replaced for all or even many users. Those who are disabled or infirm cannot easily substitute car journeys with bike travel: the elderly; the disabled; those caring for young children (particularly uncertain bike users and those with multiple children to care for); those wishing to use cars for supermarket or other bulky shopping; those who wish to commute to work and have no facilities for showering or changing on arrival; those who have lengthy and tiring commutes at present, for which the car is the final (short) element of a long journey (for those commuting into London from outside Guildford, a daily 3 hour commute is typical; this cannot realistically be extended by extensive cycling). All these factors mean that the replacement of the car with cycle use is likely to be overstated by many studies, particularly given narrow roads which do not allow effective or safe bike lanes.

Funding is not the only - nor the main - obstacle to improving infrastructure within the borough, and this seems not to be recognized. Guildford is a gap town, set in a bowl within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the south of the borough, and with large sections of the borough affected by the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area to the north. There is a ribbon through the middle of the borough which contains rail and road links to London, but is already heavily congested, is Green Belt, AONB, SPA or more than one of the above. Very little of the borough is available for extensive development of infrastructure or any building. Do we really want solutions that involve driving new roads through our remaining countryside – including the AONB – at huge cost in financial and environmental terms. Such solutions may be the only ones left when the inadequacies of this proposed Local Plan are realised after the event.

Policy indicates note an intention to pool Community Infrastructure Levy from most new build development and to use CIL receipts to assist in provision of infrastructure needed to support the delivery of the plan. As with other aspects of planning, there is a failure to recognize that out of town settlements in particular have particularly high requirements for additional new basic infrastructure in order to exist at all – roads, sewers, water provision, electricity, gas, telephone and broadband links will all need to be provided and in many cases the links to existing services will need to be upgraded before these can be implemented. The ability to divert funds from CIL to other uses will be inherently limited, not least that otherwise the proposed settlements will not be able to function. The Council strategy of taking CIL from new build in the Green Belt seems to be to pay for roads within the town centre, as indicated in the policy which notes that legislation prevents the use of planning obligations to fund existing infrastructure deficits.

In the reasoned justification, it is indicated that the council will be prepared to negotiate if an applicant claims that the infrastructure requirements for their development make it unviable. This means that some developments will go ahead anyway and worsen the infrastructure deficit. The Policy claims that infrastructure needed “should” be provided and available when first needed but we have no confidence in the council enforcing this.

The absolute constraint on developmental capacity within the borough represented by the infrastructure limitations cannot be swept aside, but the council has ignored this and failed to apply a constraint on the housing number.

We are not convinced that the extent of existing traffic congestion has been fully recognised by the SCC transport assessment because the methodology employed waters down the level of traffic observed. This has knock-on effects when modelling the various development scenarios. The result is that the requirements identified (expensive though they may seem) are the tip of the iceberg. One of the easiest issues to understand is the use of average peak hour flows for the baseline data. SCC acknowledge that that this is “typically lower” (see Transport Assessment 4.13.4 but GBC prefer the
averaging approach with some eloquent wording in their Headline network metrics (3.9). A much better solution would have been to collect reliable baseline data that allowed for the effects of queuing and modelled each hour (or a shorter time period). Such an approach would have cost more but GBC seem unwilling to go the extra mile for reliable evidence while being content to spend large sums of money on propaganda exercises such as their one-sided video. There are other more technical reasons why the transport assessment methodology fails to fully identify current and planned congestion.

Planned developments for Guildford and Waverley Boroughs were modelled together but growth for the rest of the UK was allowed for only using the DoT forecasts. As a result it is not clear whether adequate allowance has been made for significant developments planned for Woking and other neighbouring Boroughs. This represents an inconsistency in approach with the West Surrey SHMA.

Many of the results for the PM peak are missing (TA 4.1.11 states that “these can be set out in an addendum report at a later date”). We believe that those who need to travel on the roads in peak hours will be every bit as interested in their future journeys home as they are for going to work. Publication of the Transport Assessment was delayed until the start of the consultation period so perhaps the non-inclusion of many PM results was simply a result of running out of time.

The Model Development Validation Report does include some interesting baseline data that may be of interest to residents in terms of local knowledge of traffic.

We are not convinced that it would be practical or desirable to end up in a position where the only solution to traffic congestion is to build many more new roads as by-passes through the Surrey countryside, or turn existing roads into dual carriageways, or demolish buildings (some of which may be historic) in order to accommodate higher capacity junctions in built-up areas.

It is noted that the infrastructure Development Plan was developed using hotspots identified in “OGSTAR” (the previous Transport Assessment used for the 2014 consultation) as a starting point. (See Transport Topic Paper (5.56)). However, the site list used for OGSTAR was not even compatible with the former draft Local Plan let alone the current one. Despite this, the Key Evidence mentions the June 2016 TA but not OGSTAR.

Appendix C (Infrastructure Schedule) is lacking in detail concerning what work will actually be carried out for most of the Local Road Network projects and the cost estimates are clearly at the guesswork stage suggesting that these schemes have not been fully thought through or checked for viability. If more detail is available then why not provide it.

It is not clear whether CIL will be received in time to put the required infrastructure in place for each development – or what penalties will be applied for late payment.

The Monitoring Indicators rely entirely on annual CIL receipts and spending. Surely they should look at actual infrastructure delivery and any changes in its adequacy.

The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. **Congestion will worsen.** The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9590  Respondent: 8643393 / Sue Baker  Agent:  
**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Furthermore, the infrastructure proposals put forward in the plan are totally inadequate to cope with the current needs of residents in these villages and the additional strain on local services would be unacceptable if these proposals go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5224  Respondent: 8655233 / Kay Mackay  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the fact that there has been no forward planning regarding the infrastructure with regard to water supply (water companies need 10 years advance warning of large supply requirements) which is under great pressure in the local area.

I strongly object to a plan that has made no extra provision for the pressure this will put on the local hospital with no provision or planning.

I strongly object to a plan that has made no provision for waste disposal of the large developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5241  Respondent: 8655233 / Kay Mackay  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?
As a cyclist, a walker and a bus user I am only too aware that the town does not provide adequate provision for non-car modes of transport. The town needs more and better cycle lanes, far more pedestrian crossings (for example on the Epsom Road) and a more sensible ticketing system on buses (eg the 'kangaroo ticket' used in London) to encourage sustainable transport.

Such changes are discussed but sadly not implemented.

Substantial increases in housing numbers will add to congestion, which is already a huge problem in the town. A single incident regularly creates gridlock throughout Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a precondition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development nonviable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services. Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits “we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:
- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/616  **Respondent:** 8667937 / Gordon Holliday  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The eradication of 72-hectares of virgin green belt land between West Ward Lane and Glaziers Lane is going to be a complete lottery for those that have houses on this site. It is a very badly though-out idea. Flooding problems in Normandy are well documented, so water running off houses, roads and driveways of 1,150 homes will only make the matter worse. We have enough problems in Glaziers Lane with sewage backing-up out of residents toilets as it is. What happens when new house owners start getting sewage coming up through their new toilets, I wonder! Will Taylor Woodrow give them their money back?

I am fortunate enough in having 4-head teachers as neighbours living very close by and they all tell me every school in Guildford is under subscribed. This is a fact. So why build a school that is not needed in an area that has poor transport links. Thus bringing even more traffic into an all ready over congested area. The building of a school is little more than a sweetener to catch the eyes of the planners. Once again, this is a badly thought-out idea.

I would ask the GBC planners to scrap the idea of such a lot of houses being built in Normandy. The present infrastructure cannot cope with this type of large housing scheme.

The facts I have given are truly relevant to the future of Normandy and its residents.

I strongly object to the Local Plan and the chaos it will bring to Normandy.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2324  **Respondent:** 8671969 / Valerie Thompson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

11/12/13 Infrastructure and delivery and Dept of Transport Strategy
See my comments under D2/D4

I object to the Draft Local Plan in every respect on these policies.

Plans are too vague and too far in the future to beneficially affect, new residents encouraged by GBC to settle around Guildford, and as for the existing residents, their lives will be made a misery by excessive road widening, footpaths and cycletracks changing the whole image of the Borough.

Buses were not able to travel between the proposed Wisley site and Effingham station. There are not sufficient buses anywhere, and are underused, generally, as people prefer to commute by car.

Station carparks are full already, with no possibility of extension at Horsley or Effingham.

The elderly, children and disabled are not able to walk or cycle long distances. The idea that most people will return to these primitive ways of getting around is unrealistic.

Many roads cannot be widened for footpaths or cycletracks.

The new stations proposed will slow commuter trains to London, but may relieve the other carparks. It is uncertain from documents whether these are a reality or just a dream.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/56  Respondent: 8671969 / Valerie Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure

I object to most of GBC’s plans as they have proposed no realistic infrastructure improvements.

The A3/M25 interchange will cause even more air pollution than already exists, which is well above permitted levels for development.

It will swallow up huge amounts of common land.

It will direct Wisley Garden traffic onto an already over-used junction (Ripley/East Horsley), which, it is suggested will also be the exit and entrance point for the proposed development of Three Farms Meadows, (erroneously re-named Wisley airfield).

The congestion will result in tailbacks even further West in a London-bound direction, along the A3, than there are at present. (often 2 miles before the A3/M25 junction)

Ripley is threatened with ALL the traffic from Wisley, heading West on the A3, going through the village, which was by-passed in order to reduce the traffic.

I object to the plans to close roads around Wisley or to make some one way only. This will be very disruptive to traffic from other places trying to get through Ripley, or on to the A3 or from Ockham to Cobham.
A3: There are no proposals for meaningful improvements to the A3 around Guildford. At present one may be stuck in heavy traffic for 45 minutes on a daily basis, as one covers no more than 2 miles travelling Westwards. A tunnel might help but is there any realistic prospect of that being completed in the Plan period?

Roads: There are no proposals to widen or improve the surface of poor roads in and around Guildford. Many roads cannot be widened, therefore the increased traffic from the planned 12,426 new houses (approximately 24,000 extra cars) will cause grid-locks and serious congestion, within the town and in the small rural roads in and around villages.

Surgeries: There are no proposals for new surgeries in most of the areas GBC proposes to develop.

At present, most surgeries are managing at the limit of their capabilities. Many surgeries have no room to expand, even if they could find sufficient doctors, nor to expand their car-parks.

Schools: Most schools are at full capacity. Not enough new schools have been proposed.

Water and sewage: Many of the sites proposed will have difficulty in bringing in sufficient water supplies. New sewage farms would need to be built at most of the sites. At Wisley, proposals suggest that the Ripley sewage works could accommodate the waste from an extra 2000 houses. It cannot.

Trains; a new station at Burpham is a good idea. It might take the pressure off Horsley and Effingham.

Buses; Suggestions by the Wisley developers that buses might run every 10 minutes to Woking station are ludicrous. It is also unrealistic to run buses to Effingham as the road is too narrow and unsafe.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/373  Respondent: 8686913 / John and Susan Burge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Before any proposals to new housing schemes are considered, the infrastructure, particularly in East & West Horsley, needs a vast amount of development – schools, doctors’ surgeries, supply of water and drainage, roads, railway car-parks.

I OBJECT to new/revised proposals in the Horsleys until the infrastructure has been improved hugely.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1549  Respondent: 8687041 / Michael Aaronson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that so much housing development is included in the Local Plan with so little realistic appreciation of the strain this will place on the transport and other infrastructure and so little evidence of advance planning. Reassurances from the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure that all this will be taken care of at the detailed planning stage
are not adequate; it is irresponsible to base a Local Plan on infrastructure improvement that may or may not be forthcoming - especially when this entails taking land out of the Green Belt. The Leader of the Council has said he will not support the housing numbers in the latest draft of the Plan without the infrastructure improvements, but how can we have faith in future promises from third parties about the infrastructure that may or may not be delivered?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY) • Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan. • Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure. • Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure. • Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first. • No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8893  Respondent: 8694369 / Nicola Ogilvie Smals  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In order to accommodate the infrastructure upgrades required to accommodate the huge expansion of West Horsley a full study must be undertaken. As a minimum the following infrastructure issues are pertinent:

Primary schools; the Raleigh is already oversubscribed to the extent that many residents of West Horsley south are unable to secure places for their children resulting in twice daily car journeys to neighbouring villages of Effingham and Clandon, expansion of the school is not possible with the current confines of the school grounds therefore expansion of the village will exacerbate the problem of capacity and will therefore increase local traffic to other schools;

Secondary schooling is generally obtained at the Howard of Effingham School, which is itself the subject of uncertainty as a result of the Draft Plan;

Drainage is a notable problem within the village currently, but any proposals must take into account the costs of upgrades;

There are poor provisions for pedestrians outside of East Horsley; West Horsley North does not have street lighting or appropriately sized pavements;

Local facilities such as the medical centre and parking for local shops must also be considered alongside capacity of the car park at Horsley Station.

The CIL as a tariff will pool resources however there are a number of specific local infrastructure improvements that must be taken into account. The infrastructure delivery plan makes little note of these local issues which are of significant importance given the proposed 100% increase in size to West Horsley North.

Site A38 contains an oversubscribed nursery school employing around 30 members of staff including support staff and around 100 children are on the role; it is unclear whether the proposals to develop this site include the retention the existing nursery leased from the land owner or whether it will be forced to close resulting in a loss of employment including many jobs for 18-24 year olds including training; furthermore this nursery school provides an essential service to residents. If the nursery school continues to operate there will be a considerable effect on the setting of the nursery and the planning application will require extensive consideration of size, access and safety issues. If the Nursery School remains, the density of the development at site A38 will be increased further which will be even less in keeping with the scale of the surroundings.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3578  Respondent: 8694785 / Nicolas Dixon  Agent: 

---
The total number of houses proposed could lead to there being upwards of 5000 additional cars on the local roads. Roads are already very busy and car parking provision is minimal. I therefore foresee severe traffic congestion particularly at the junction of Ockham Road North with the A3, unless there are major road improvements.

Both the local school and medical centre are already at virtually full capacity.

And there might eventually be at least 12000 alltime people living in the area, it is clear that these services would be unable to cope without major new provision.

There would also need to be a big expansion of local shops.

Can the developers be relied upon to finance the expansion of the extra services?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14694  Respondent: 8694977 / James Lewis  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Then there are the infrastructure needs, sewerage etc., which will have to be be built, causing further traffic disruption.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/984  Respondent: 8697025 / Barry Pearce  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )


Having viewed the latest plans I wish to lodge my objection to these on the basis of my previous objection's, and in particular the effect they will have on the infrastructure and services which are already at the limit.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3411  Respondent: 8703585 / N J Axten  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )


Having viewed the latest plans I wish to lodge my objection to these on the basis of my previous objection's, and in particular the effect they will have on the infrastructure and services which are already at the limit.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

There are not sufficient Schools/Academies to educate possibly up to 10,000 children in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

There are insufficient shopping and parking facilities

The roads in the area cannot take any increase in traffic as this contribute to grave danger to all users (car drivers, pedestrians and cyclists, etc)

The air pollution is already at a high level and any increase caused would be well in excess of the legal level.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I write to complain about the latest version of the "local plan" for West Horsley

This plan would represent the largest change, over a short period, experienced by Horsley in the last 1000 years!! Our infrastructure would be incapable of coping with this.
The roads are already congested and public transport cannot take any more.

Other items of concern are :-

Schools
Shops
Medical center
Surface water
Main drainage
Policing
Public open spaces

Other items which would soon start to break down are

Electricity
Mains Water
Gas
Telephone systems ( inc BroadBand )

all these matters will require urgent attention, and should be an integral part of any 'Plan'

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11501  Respondent: 8706625 / Hilary Barker  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

_I OBJECT_ to the lack of forward planning by GBC as the Infrastructure delivery schedule is not developed enough to support even the 5 year programme.

This council has a very poor record of delivering infrastructure to support developments. GBC freely admitted in the previous draft plan that “infrastructure provision has not kept pace with housing development.” I feel this remains much the same.

- The current poor state of infrastructure must be remedied in advance of adding further strain by increasing populations.
- Road infrastructure is a very basic need. The road system around Guildford is already gridlocked at peak times and the amount of traffic is beyond the capacity of most feeder roads from the North, West and East of Guildford.
- Primary and Secondary school places will not keep up with demand.
- Doctor’s surgeries with more doctors and facilities need to be built and staffed.
- The Royal Surrey Hospital is already at capacity for the existing population.
• Sewerage system in parts of Guildford – particularly around the NW and Fairlands is not fit for purpose for the current population let alone more housing in the area.

• ROADS: There are no known plans to improve the already serious road congestion on the A322 and A323 – a crucial factor in the refusal of two previous applications. These roads along with the A320, A31 and A3 are all major problems as they all funnel towards the Dennis Roundabout. These roads cannot cope with the extra cars generated by 693 new homes.
• The road system around Guildford is already gridlocked at peak times and the amount of traffic is beyond the capacity of most feeder roads from the North, West and East of Guildford.
• SCHOOLS: primary schools are expanding to meet the current demand on places but won’t be able to offer places to new arrivals in the area. At 11 they will need to move on to Secondary Schools. Can SCC afford to build new schools and pay teacher’s salaries?
• DOCTOR’S SURGERIES are already over-subscribed. The developers may build new surgeries but can SCC afford to pay the doctors and nurses to staff them?
• THE SEWARAGE SYSTEM, in many areas are already at capacity and not fit for purpose for the current population let alone another 693 homes.
• WATER SUPPLY in the NW corner of Guildford is becoming a problem with falling water pressure - the bore holes on the Hogs Back are said to be under strain.
• FLOODING in Worplesdon continues to be a problem.
• ELECTRICITY SUPPLY is not consistent in Worplesdon and other villages in the NW of Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15024  Respondent: 8708545 / Nigel Wicks  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object because of the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are already in a poor condition as a result of insufficient public funds for their maintenance and renewal.

I object to the development proposed in the local plan. It will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The Council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road rendering it dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. Yet the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording is silent about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours, ignoring the effects of junctions and understating peak demand - hides the problem, which will worsen as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing green field over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will be provided housebuilding without providing evidence that it is likely to materialize. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) income. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways:

- Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. Without commitments to improve these services, there should be no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
- Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
- Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
- There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4502</th>
<th>Respondent: 8709249 / Geoff Spink</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. POLICY I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17672  Respondent: 8709601 / Robert Fletcher  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Inadequate Infrastructure Planning**

I was astounded to discover that the Borough's Infrastructure Delivery Plan failed to address these issues at all, let alone adequately. No planning gain seems to have been outlined in the proposal.

The proposed local plan for the Horsleys is a travesty when set against the criteria of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that new residential development must respect the character and density of housing in the area and be limited in quantity by the availability of infrastructure and local facilities.

Sadly, the drive behind the plan appears to be to maximise the financial opportunity for developers in the area over addressing the needs and well-being of council tax paying residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/1072  Respondent: 8711489 / Malcolm Wych  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

What I find suspect or flawed in all the documentation is the way the provision of additional amenities in relationship to the plan are apparently regarded by the planners as "Givens". For example new cycle paths, primary schools, roads, Doctors surgeries are shown as part of the infrastructure in support of additional housing. However in reality there is little evidence that Surrey’s budget can support things as they currently are-let alone provide additional support for an enlarged population. As one small example I have lived in East Horsley since 1990 and during that time the paths and service roads at Station Parade, Ockham Road South have never been resurfaced or upgraded. A small example maybe but if the
Council cannot attend to a small issue like that how can it expect to fund an enlarged population and infrastructure as outlined in the plan.

As such I worry that the plan represents a "Civil Service" style response to a Government dictate to provide more homes-at whatever the cost to the Green Belt, Local environment or Village communities.

I'm worried.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4738</th>
<th>Respondent: 8711841 / Rosmarie Roberts-Kunz</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY)

- Infrastructure is considered here as an afterthought, rather than a pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Plan for excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Plan’s heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
- No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans are certain, encouraging opportunistic over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/108</th>
<th>Respondent: 8712449 / Marie &amp; Ken Scotland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Infrastructure Policies.

Policy ID1 (p.122) states that "Infrastructure necessary to support new development will be provided and available when first needed".

Garlick Arch (Site 43) is identified as an area for the introduction of some 400 homes, and a new interchange with the A3 trunk road is proposed (Site 43a). Both of these are likely to give rise to significant extra traffic on the A247, which runs through West Clandon village. There is already some congestion at peak times in the village, as well as numerous accidents due to the narrowness and poor driver visibility in parts of the village. There is no scope for road widening or of line-of-sight visibility in these places, so these proposed developments appear to be in violation of the Plan's policies.
I hope these reservations will be properly taken into account,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/164  Respondent: 8713889 / Joyce Campbell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The villages within the Guildford Borough are already choked with traffic, the roads are in a parlous state, drains are frequently blocked leading to flooding after even a short shower, schools are over-subscribed and medical services are already over-stretched. The arrival of 500 - 600 more families will place an intolerable burden on the local infrastructure and amenities. Even the increased Council Tax income from all these new homes is unlikely to be adequate to cover the additional demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17069  Respondent: 8717921 / Helen Jefferies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object due to the unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic including many years of construction traffic
- I object due to the fact that local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed by large numbers of additional residents – it is already difficult to get an appointment at the GP and the RSCH is failing to meet waiting times for outpatients’
- I object due to the impact of large numbers of additional residents on local policing facilities which will be further Surrey Police are currently unable to cope with dealing with local residents’ concerns [eg breach of law on PROWs on allocation A35] citing lack of resources.
- I object to the impact of large numbers of new residents on school places which has not been properly For example, Send Primary School (in the process of being rebuilt) is being rebuilt with no spare capacity. The proposed redevelopment of the Raleigh School in Horsley [not even in the local plan] is only for redevelopment not for enlargement. Schools planned for Three Farms Meadows will not be operational for the first 500 houses of development. Where will those children go to school? There is no capacity. When the school is built at TFM children will have to be bussed in from elsewhere as it’s not possible to walk… adding to congestion on local roads and the Strategic Road Network. Does one hand know what the other one is doing because it certainly does not look like it to me?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for.

The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration.

Adequate infrastructure provision must be a pre-condition of sustainable development, this is key.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3502  Respondent: 8726529 / Eric Palmer  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
In summary my objections are very much directed to the inadequacy of the Plan to support new housing with the necessary infrastructure and especially relating to the road network which already creaks with the existing amount of traffic. In places the Greenbelt is being sacrificed for homes that will most probably be proven unaffordable which in turn will change the developers plans and promises made to finance new infrastructure.

I propose that as a minimum the planned development at Garlicks Arch be withdrawn and that a detailed road traffic relief plan be undertaken and committed to before any development at all is agreed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1712</th>
<th>Respondent: 8726689 / David Shaw</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is concern about the inability of current infrastructure to meet current and future needs. The policy recognises that the “Infrastructure provider” will maintain infrastructure in most cases, and developers can only offer a contribution via Community Infrastructure Levy. Until the current infrastructure can meet existing needs adequately, further development should be very targeted to meet only absolute essentials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12876</th>
<th>Respondent: 8727457 / Nuala Crampin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 11 Infrastructure and Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a lack of strategic overall planning of infrastructure, in particular roads, water drainage and sewerage, and a dependence on developers' schemes to mitigate the adverse effects of their plans, which they present in order to obtain planning permission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9466</th>
<th>Respondent: 8728865 / Neville Bryan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Section page number Page 79 of 1294  Document page number 80*
Strongly Object

Existing infrastructure is highly constrained, with particular concern to roads, water supply and sewerage.

This again looks like a wish list rather than a plan. The stated infrastructure first cannot be implemented on this policy. Many of the key schemes like the tunnel are aspirational rather than practical. Existing roads are jammed – try going through Guildford at 8.30 am. We need one co-ordinated transport strategy, but this is piecemeal based on developments which may never happen.

**If 14,000 houses are built as this document suggests this policy will not support the 28,000 additional cars on the road. This is implies a serious constraint which needs to be applied in Policy S2.**

CIL strategy as drafted also encourages development on green field sites rather than brownfield.

SANG strategy is flawed. I see no practical way the Thames Basin will be protected by sites like Russell Place Farm as proposed. We also believe the Russell Place Farm SANG already an application before this consultation has been predetermined. It seems GBC approach to SANGS is as a method of building houses on the Greenbelt rather than adding them as a valued community asset.

The Hockford Sewage works have been omitted in error. Without this being seriously upgraded, the whole of the west of Guildford will not be able to get rid of sewerage.

Policy I2: Supporting the Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

Object

What happened to integration? This should be part of policy I1.

The A3 tunnel is not funded.

Infrastructure funding and support is needed before housing and employment growth are factored in.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16905  **Respondent:** 8728865 / Neville Bryan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery

Strongly Object

Existing infrastructure is highly constrained, with particular concern to roads, water supply and sewerage.

We doubt this policy, led as it is by developer contributions (mainly from Greenfield sites requiring significant infrastructure of all types) is deliverable. Many of the key schemes like the tunnel are aspirational rather than practical. Existing roads are jammed – try going through Guildford at 8.30 am.  **We need one co-ordinated transport strategy,** but this is piecemeal based on developments which may never happen. If 14,000 houses are built as this document suggests this policy will not support the 28,000 additional cars on the road.
A strong policy here is not possible and this should be used as a major constraint on building on the greenbelt.

CIL strategy as drafted also encourages development on green field sites rather than brownfield.

SANG strategy is flawed. We see no practical way the Thames Basin will be protected by sites like Russell Place Farm as proposed. We also believe the Russell Place Farm SANG already an application before this consultation has been predetermined. It seems GBC approach to SANGS is as a method of building houses on the Greenbelt rather than adding them as a valued community asset.

We note the wording at the end of the Policy which indicates that the council is more interested in meeting its legal responsibilities than actually protecting wildlife. GBC is failing to take account of existing biodiversity at sites selected for SANG provision.

Paragraph 3.6 of the Infrastructure Study is incorrect. The Hockford Sewage works have been omitted in error.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1900  Respondent: 8728865 / Neville Bryan  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Strongly Object

I do not believe the maths support developer funding the infrastructure and the affordable housing requirements via any method, including CIL. Indeed it is doubtful they would they would add up to a significant part of either infrastructure OR affordable housing costs required. On this point alone the proposed plan fails.

Since the previous plan, Guildford has been identified as the 4th most congested town in England.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17890  Respondent: 8729025 / Richard Clark  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure

There are any number of infrastructure pinch points, consideration of which appear to be an after thought with very little in the way of upfront commitment to solving the capacity issues ahead of building extra homes. Road, rail, schools, sewage, waste disposal, GPs, emergency services, to name but a few, all need scaling up or scaling out first, well ahead of considering building significant numbers of new homes. Solving these issues afterwards is not good enough, many are overstretched already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the changes in Policy 1D1, particularly the proposals that “delivery of infrastructure will be secured by planning condition and/or planning obligation.” (2) and “If the timely provision of infrastructure necessary to support new development cannot be secured, planning permission will be refused.” (3). This acknowledges that the provision of necessary infrastructure to unlock development may not be “secured” within five years and the Plan therefore runs counter to the NPPF[11], which states that:

“To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable.”

The whole approach underpinning Guildford’s Local Plan is to allocate land for housing that does not currently have the infrastructure needed to support it in the hope that this will be provided downstream by the government (in terms of the A3 widening) or by developers. However, there is a risk that these schemes will not come to fruition: the widening of the A3 is uncertain, being subject to budget constraints and the whims of different government ministers (Annex 3); whilst required local road infrastructure could fail to be delivered if the developer abandons the project without fulfilling all the conditions and obligations, or claims that the cost of delivery is not viable (para 4.6.8 suggests that GBC would be prepared to negotiate reduced infrastructure requirements). This is a particular risk in the case of the Blackwell Farm allocation (A26), where the landowner (University of Surrey) has already demonstrated a poor track record in meeting the commitments it made at the last Local Plan.

I object to the fact that the changes within policy 1D1 (and indeed the whole policy) are based on flawed traffic modelling. Despite recommendations from Highways England (HE) (Annex 4) and other commentators on the Local Plan that the modelling should be revised using the latest OmniTRANS software tool (version 6.0.22), GBC has failed to instruct Surrey County Highways to update its modelling accordingly, and instead appears to have tried to browbeat HE into accepting less reliable modelling assumptions, as is apparent from the minutes to its meeting with HE on September 1 (Annex 5).

A Technical Note prepared by Mouchel on behalf of HE in response to the 2016 Local Plan (Annex 4) concludes that: “the future updated model, using the latest version of the OmniTRANS software, should help to address some of the concerns by including blocking back and true peak hours, but the inability to model merge delays on the A3 will remain a significant limitation. The results from the new version of the model could be significantly different from those presented in the GBC’s current Local Plan evidence Base.” [Page 6 – emphasis mine.]

It is unsound to base housing allocations on traffic scenarios that have been skewed by using outdated traffic modelling software and do not reflect the true situation.

I object to the deletion of infrastructure project SRN6 (Beechcroft Drive new access road/road safety scheme) from this version of the plan. The current access (a 90 degree junction on a blind bend of the A3) is dangerous not just to the residents of Beechcroft Drive, but to all drivers travelling on the A3.

The Manor Farm Master Plan (2004) states: “Benefits secured by legal agreement include… commitment to exploring ways of alleviating Beechcroft Drive access problems.” (Section 8.8). Thirteen years later this access has not been provided. If the University/GBC cannot fund a few metres of road linking Beechcroft Drive to Manor Farm in order to provide safe access for 21 existing residences (some with young families), it is questionable whether they would bother to pay to enforce a controlled section of the new link road from the A31 to Gill Avenue.

Thank you for inviting me to comment on the local plan.

I am very strongly against the building of so many new houses. When the local roads are already far too full, why are we trying to make the situation even worse by bringing in more people and cars. The schools are already too full – I understand it is quite difficult to get the school of one’s choice for our children. It gets more difficult to make appointments with doctors and we are rapidly losing our green and pleasant land and our attractive villages will lose their identity.

I think it would be much more sensible to stop the ever increasing immigration figures so that all these new houses will not be needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/124  Respondent: 8731649 / Ian Slater  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13926  Respondent: 8732993 / Michael Weber  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy, as it is, is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy, as it is, is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy, as it is, is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15808  Respondent: 8732993 / Michael Weber  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.
Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4449  **Respondent:** 8734241 / Andrew Ingham  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Points that need to be addressed include:

**Provision of nursery and school places** - Schools in the area are already heavily oversubscribed, with no additional schools where will the influx of children be educated? Nurseries are already at maximum capacity - parents of young children will not have the choice of going to work if they cannot find affordable child care facilities in the local area.

**Rail Travel** - Those living in Horsley and the surrounding villages, who need to work in London, need viable transport options to commute into work. Peak rail services are already at maximum capacity and overcrowded. Minor problems on the network regularly cause huge difficulties for commuters getting to and from work. Car parks at Effingham Junction and Horsley stations are already full most days and cycling is positively dangerous in the dark given the very poor state of the roads and lack of street lighting. Given the distance of these new developments from the station, lack of paths and lighting, walking is not realistic for most.
**Roads** - No new roads are identified in the plan. Roads in the Horsleys are already inadequately sized, in a dreadful state and continually subject to roadworks and repair which regularly cause delays. Roads are very busy at peak times and could not take the inevitable significant increase in work and school traffic that would result. This would lead to gridlock at rush hour and significant noise and air pollution. Limited traffic controls also mean that speeding is a common problem - the number of accidents and injuries will continue to increase.

**Utilities** - Roads in the area are continually being dug up by utility companies due to deficiencies in the existing infrastructure. These need to be upgraded to cope with the increased demand. Water pressure in many parts is already too low and broadband speeds are not great. There appear to be no plans to roll out fibre based communications in Horsley and so the extra demand on existing telecoms infrastructure will just slow down access for everyone. This will put a stop to any home working aspirations residents might have.

Many people have chosen to live in the area due to its village nature and heritage which makes it special. The surrounding countryside is also a huge benefit to the quality of life and health of local residents and London visitors who flocked to the area in the recent 2012 Olympics. This quality of life is something that should not be underestimated and therefore protected at all costs.

In summary, the plan is not fit for purpose. It does not make sense from an environment and economic perspective to keep adding homes to local villages without consideration for the infrastructure which will slowly erode the viability of the village. That plan is poorly thought through and everyone will suffer. Do we really want or even need the Guildford borough population to be subject to uncontrolled increase year on year?

There are also many other options which should be considered first before the easier and higher profit option of bulldozing green field sites. There are numerous brownfield sites which could be identified with a little effort and developed using innovative solutions. Poorly utilised existing sites such as sprawling car parks around Guildford town centre which could be more efficiently utilised. London is also not very far away and is better sized to accommodate the population numbers proposed.

I object to proposals to put up large swathes of Green Belt land up for development due to the irreparable damage that will be caused. I hope you are able to give my comments the attention they deserve and urge you to rethink the proposals outlined in the plan.

I would urge you to remember that once our outstandingly beautiful countryside and Greenbelt land has been bulldozed to make way for homes, it will be gone forever, for us and our generations to come.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12944  **Respondent:** 8735873 / David and Gillian Allan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1331  **Respondent:** 8740321 / J McClellan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

*DOCTORS AND SCHOOLS Policy I1, Infrastructure and delivery I OBJECT to the strain all the extra people will put on medical facilities. It is very difficult to get a doctor's appointment even now and all local schools are full to overflowing with "temporary"classrooms dotted around.*

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1334  **Respondent:** 8740321 / J McClellan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

*INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY. Policy 11

I OBJECT, infrastructure is already hopelessly congested and cannot cope with even organic growth. The policy does not seem to mention roads and traffic which is the major cause of congestion, anyone who drives either up or down the A3 at any time of day will tell you how congested it is. Adequate infrastructure MUST be a pre condition of sustainable development. Greenfield sites present huge infrastructure problems and brownfield sites already have it in place, so it is much more sensible to use brownfield sites.*

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5114  **Respondent:** 8741377 / Lisanne Mealing  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4493  Respondent: 8741921 / D W Hirst  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the very high number of homes required to be built year by year for the duration of the Local Plan.

My reasons are that for every home built there will inevitably be, at least one car per household, and the traffic congestion in this area will of consequence be increased to the point of standstill for long periods during the day, this has happened in the past years.

The increase in traffic congestion is also occasioned by an accident on the Farnham to Guildford road (The Hog's Back), and diverted traffic uses the A323 Aldershot to Guildford road, which runs past the fairlands Estate.

I object to the lack of information about the infrastructure necessary to accommodate the establishment of such a large volume of housing, surely, infrastructure should take priority.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1008  Respondent: 8742689 / Keith Michel  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A further and related factor, we believe, is that even allowing for the target housebuilding programme proposed in the Plan, there seems to be insufficient infrastructure projects to support the increased population envisaged in way of schools, transport and health facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7080  Respondent: 8743073 / Darrell Howard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
• The Plan fails to define the infrastructure requirements that will be needed to support the development of the proposed housing sites. As such it fails to comply with paragraph 157 of the NPPF guidelines, "Crucially, Local Plans should plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework". Policy 13 - "Sustainable Transport for new developments" indicates that developers will be expected to propose and secure travel plans for their developments and contribute to the transport arrangements for the able and disabled. The words "will be expected" are pathetically weak and developers will do everything in their power to avoid or minimise such commitments. As with the 2014 draft Local Plan, it is deeply concerning that very little work has been done to quantify the infrastructure requirements that will need to be implemented to support the proposed increase in housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7669  Respondent: 8743073 / Darrell Howard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• The Plan fails to define the infrastructure requirements that will be needed to support the development of the proposed housing sites. As such it fails to comply with paragraph 157 of the NPPF guidelines, "Crucially, Local Plans should plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework".

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7671  Respondent: 8743073 / Darrell Howard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• The proposed housing need is unsustainable. Overdevelopment will damage local communities, especially West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon. These communities do not need the housing numbers proposed. The Key Evidence document “Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013 – 2031 makes no case for locating large numbers of dwellings in West and East Horsley or in neighbouring villages. Over 23% of the Plan’s new housing is proposed for the localities of Ripley, Ockham, Send and the Horsleys.

Development on the scale proposed in the Plan will require huge levels of investment to provide the infrastructure to support the resulting influx of thousands of new residents. Currently, the provision of primary and secondary education within the area is under considerable strain with local schools being oversubscribed for places. Children who are unfortunate enough to live outside the catchment areas for these schools must travel considerable distances to receive their education. There is only a vague reference to school provision in the Plan despite the potential for hundreds of new homes falling within its catchment areas. This raises the question as to where GBC thinks the thousands of new children will go to receive their education?

There is one GP surgery serving the Horsleys currently. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan suggests a possible extension to the Kingston Avenue Medical Practice. However, here is no evidence to suggest that development of the scale proposed
in the Plan will lead to additional GP provision within the timescales of the new development. As such the existing surgery would quite literally be swamped and be unable to provide anything like an adequate service.

The construction of 2,500 homes in the Ockham and Horsleys area will substantially increase the congestion on what are poorly maintained “B” and “C” category roads. It is also fair to conclude that the accompanying increase in traffic volume from such a massive population increase will accelerate the speed that these roads deteriorate and therefore, the frequency and cost of maintaining them. In addition the knock on effect of having thousands of new traffic journeys per day will quite literally gridlock the area, and will directly impact on the traffic flow on both the north and southbound A3 carriageways, and quite probably the M25/A3 junction.

Whilst Horsley station has frequent trains to London and Guildford, it is highly unlikely that the current or future train service provider will improve its peak time service to accommodate the increase in commuters.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13873  Respondent: 8743137 / Ben Woodford  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13881  Respondent: 8743137 / Ben Woodford  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes will lead to flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9682  Respondent: 8743969 / Daphne Padfield  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes will lead to flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The schools are already full, visits to the surgery require a wait of many days, the station car park is full to bursting, the rush hour traffic is horrendous, the village halls have to limit entry on occasions and the car parking there is very inadequate. Our roads are full of potholes, electricity cables need renewing, as I know from personal experience, and the bus service is neither here nor there. I have no knowledge of the state of the gas or water supply, let alone the sewerage system but in view of the annual growth of population over recent years imagine it must already be under pressure.

To propose building another 500+ houses when current residents are already under strain from lack of the above facilities appears to be sheer folly. And I understand that there is still the possibility of adding to the chaos by developing Wisley airfield. The mind boggles and a great big red flag for danger should be waving over this part of the borough to alert the council, and anyone thinking of moving to this area.

More houses - yes, if really essential, but far less of them and with increased infrastructure to support them and us.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3918  
Respondent: 8744161 / Michael Bridge  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.
1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3940  Respondent: 8744257 / Mary E Bridge  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/316  Respondent: 8746465 / Matthew Tipper  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policies 11, 12, 13 : Infrastructure Policies
As a long term resident I believe the Borough's infrastructure is already stretched, and that the enormous building programme proposed by GBC would serve to worsen existing problems. East Horsley has country lanes not roads. These are unsuited to the volumes of traffic using them already. Any commitment to a massive housing expansion ahead of a plan and finance for the required transport network would make our traffic congestion even worse. A very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the local plan. Furthermore, there are insufficient school spaces already and the medical centre is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients. I object to the infrastructure proposals on the grounds that they fail to meet the needs of the proposed plan, which is it itself a product of inflated forecasts of immigration that are not accurate, necessary or welcome.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/921  Respondent: 8746465 / Matthew Tipper  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a long term resident I believe the Borough's infrastructure is already stretched, and that the enormous building programme proposed by GBC would serve to worsen existing problems. East Horsley has country lanes not roads. These are unsuited to the volumes of traffic using them already. Any commitment to a massive housing expansion ahead of a plan and finance for the required transport network would make our traffic congestion even worse. A very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the local plan. Furthermore, there are insufficient school spaces already and the medical centre is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients. I object to the infrastructure proposals on the grounds that they fail to meet the needs of the proposed plan, which is it itself a product of inflated forecasts of immigration that are not accurate, necessary or welcome.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2668  Respondent: 8746753 / Miles Hackett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
I am writing to register my objections to the New Local Plan.

The Plan does not seem to have a clear design for the whole area. If it does not certainly is not making it clear. Firstly the Transport Plan has been produced very late in the day (only released on the day of publication) and without this infrastructure, none of the developments should take place. It seems that Guildford Borough Council is planning a series of large developments along the A3 corridor but has not thoroughly looked at the impact of the is for the surrounding villages. The villages on both sides of the A3 have very inadequate roads to cope with the anticipated amount of traffic and the roads available cannot be improved to the point that will ease the expected congestion. There are many other worries as well; such as environmental concerns, noise pollution, air pollution levels, flood risks, the sheer quantity of housing and industrial units supposedly required, the list goes on ...

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1408  Respondent: 8746753 / Miles Hackett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is proposed that around 40% of the new development in the Borough is to be in and around Send and bearing in mind that we represent only 11% of the Borough this seems to be excessive. The main reason for my objection is that it will destroy the Green Belt. Additionally the layout, infrastructure, facilities and local requirements have not been planned which will potentially lead to an unstructured, chaotic new town and it seems that some high level local politicians have a vested interest in doing just this. This must be formally investigated by the Planning Inspectorate before any further Green Belt land is allowed to be destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16310  Respondent: 8749409 / Mrs Randall  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Reference Policy 11 – Infrastructure, page 108 et seq

Also with regard to sustainability it should be mentioned that of the homes which have already received approval no CIL contributions have been received due to the lack of an up to date plan. Consequently no funds have been made available to provide/maintain necessary infrastructure. Policy 11 at 4.6.1 of the Plan states “We will use CIL receipts towards providing infrastructure to support development and will facilitate the spending of up to one quarter of CIL receipts originating from each Parish……on local priorities to support development”. It seems that to a greater or lesser extent - no doubt the former – Ash and Tongham will already have been disadvantaged in this respect due to the recent wave of planning applications received and approved. Obviously no retrospection would be available but it does seem grossly unfair that by taking an early hit with developments the area is not benefiting in any meaningful way. However there may be scope for redressing the balance somewhat with the implementation of the provisions of 4.6.7 regarding the use of CIL contributions by GBC “to increase the capacity of existing infrastructure or to repair failing existing infrastructure, if that
is necessary to support development”. Further details of how this would work out in practice will no doubt follow in due course. Hopefully Ash and Tongham area will receive favourable consideration in this area when future developments come forward as they surely will. Presumably any such use of CIL contributions by GBC under these particular provisions will be additional to the allocation to the Parish Council of the “neighbourhood” portion referred to at 4.6.10.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8136  **Respondent:** 8754273 / Jaqueline Bond  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The Impact of Additional Residential Housing and Population Increase on Local Facilities

I strongly disagree with the premise in the GBC Local Plan 2016 that Okham and the Horsleys are a suitable location for a large number of additional new houses. The housing numbers proposed for Guildford Borough are for 13040 homes over 15 years from 2016 to 2031. This number is too high. The number is based on a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which the council required to be amended by the Head of Planning. This amendment has not taken place and therefore the number of new builds proposed in the Draft Local Plan has no basis. I object to Guildford Council proposing a Draft Local Plan on the basis of flawed evidence.

As an inhabitant of West Horsley I know at first hand the existing population pressure on local facilities. The primary school in our neighbourhood (The Raleigh) is oversubscribed, in common with the local secondary school, the Howard of Effingham. Indeed, in spite of being a Horsley resident, I was not able to secure a place for my daughter in either school.

The local medical centre is also filled to capacity. Residents of adjacent villages e.g., Ripley, East and West Clandon also use the centre. As a consequence, new residents to the village are known to register with alternative practices e.g., Bookham. In conclusion, the village services that currently exist in the Horsleys are already filled to capacity and do not have the facilities to accommodate the large number of new residents which would result from the increase in residential housing proposed in the Local Plan.

**Impact of Increased Residential Population on Transport**

An increase in the number of residents would result in a heavy increase in both construction related traffic and subsequent traffic arising from an increase in local population.

Most residents of the Horsleys work outside the villages. They either commute into London or Guildford by train, or travel by road to places of work and education. There are very few indigenous employment opportunities in the Horsleys. Essentially they are commuter dormitories. The residents of proposed additional housing are unlikely to be employed in the immediate vicinity of the Horsleys. They will therefore join existing commuters travelling either by road or rail. Horsley station car park is already filled to capacity, and there is no option to extend the car parking facilities for the station. The land is not available for expansion. Likewise, at Effingham Junction, there is little land to spare for additional parking facilities. I would conclude, therefore, there is limited potential for additional commuters to park at the local stations and commute by train. I might add, that Horsley station already serves as a rail hub for adjacent villages (e.g., Shere and Ripley), resulting in heavy road usage at peak commuting time. The housing development proposed in the Local Plan will increase the traffic volume through the village, resulting in additional air and noise pollution.
Key road links to the Horsleys focus on the A246, from Leatherhead toGuildford, and additional rural (narrow and winding) roads linking the villages to Ripley, Cobham and the A3/M25. The A246 currently carries a very high volume of commuter traffic at peak periods creating bottle necks and traffic congestion at both the Givens Grove roundabout on the Leatherhead bypass, and the Merrow roundabout on the outskirts of Guildford. The A3 likewise carries a heavy flow of traffic both into Guildford and north to the M25 at peak hours, with stationary traffic a frequent occurrence. The construction of additional housing in a rural area, which by its location and nature, requires inhabitants to travel predominantly by car, will exacerbate an already congested road network. This will clearly have safety implications, as more congested narrow, rural roads will result in a greater frequency of road traffic accidents and undoubtedly loss of life. It will also increase traffic congestion in local employment hotspots such as Guildford, and Leatherhead.

It makes much more sense to redevelop brownfield sites in Guildford and Woking to accommodate additional housing needs. This would have the advantage of providing new residents with the option of using the existing public transport network, or walking or cycling to work or school. They would also have a full range of urban facilities on their doorstep.

In conclusion, I strongly object to the new housing proposals outlined in the Draft Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

9. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages already suffer from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on local roads.

Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, West Clandon included, already suffer from traffic congestion. Development around these villages will result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become ever popular, particularly at weekends with hundreds of cyclists passing through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements, as they often need to.

10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being significant for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send, will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is not sustainable.

There is no provision for the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4892  **Respondent:** 8771233 / Ranald Mackinnon  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp171/604</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8771233 / Ranald Mackinnon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits “…we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/5587</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8771265 / H C MacKinnon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment.
without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16698  Respondent: 8772801 / David French  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12119  Respondent: 8773409 / G B Lovegrove  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The plan does not adequately state additional facilities that will be required to cope with the increased population (e.g. hospitals, schools, GP surgeries, public car parking, etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/524  Respondent: 8775137 / Annette Clark  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2) I object to the additional pressure the increased residents will have on GP and NHS services. At the current time it is almost impossible to get a GP appointment on the same day and recently had a 6 hour wait at Surrey County Hosp. Things will not improve with additional residents!!

4) Although I do not have children of my own my friends and neighbours are specifically effected by the level of current school places again I object to the increase housing and building and the additional residents will put additional pressure on exiting schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/630  Respondent: 8775169 / Shaun Cheyne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of plans for provision of services eg. doctors, schools

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/642  Respondent: 8775937 / Alan Patrick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The existing infrastructure of the villages is already overloaded. The roads already inadequate for the traffic using them now and are in poor condition, with many potholes. Many drains are blocked or in poor condition, while the pavements are narrow and in poor condition.
There is insufficient parking space at the shops, village hall, surgery and station.

The number of new houses proposed can be expected to add some 1500 more people to the numbers in the villages and generate an equal number of vehicle movements daily. The majority will not be employed locally, thus adding further to the commuter congestion.

There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, forcing them to add to the road congestion by travelling to schools some distance away from Horsley.

The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already full in terms of patient numbers.

The proposals to alleviate these infrastructure problems appear to be more of a "Wish List" than a positive action list and, unless the many objections are heeded, the existing residents, plus the incoming new residents, will just be expected to put up with the problems arising while an existing pair of villages will have been despoiled for the short term gain and the long term future.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

```
Comment ID: PSLPP16/17027  Respondent: 8787969 / K Britton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
```
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/762 **Respondent:** 8790529 / Nigel Carter **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
The Draft plan does not include any upgrade of infrastructure, and the current infrastructure will not be able to cope with the proposed increase in housing. Horsley has insufficient infrastructure to cope with the additional housing and people who would move into the area – roads, buses, schools, shops, and medical facilities are limited in the area as it is. Any increase in population would put an impossible load on these local services.

The increase in proposed homes in the area from 1111 to 1644, represents a 67% increase in dwellings for a small village. This kind of development will put an unreasonable strain on roads, drainage, utilities, parking at the station etc. which will not be able to cope.

Roads are generally in poor condition as it is with considerable damage during the past winter which has still not been effectively repaired some 8 months later – particularly East Lane and Ockham Road North and South. These are heavily trafficked as it is and a 67% increase in traffic will mean roads will soon collapse. There was extensive flooding in the area last winter – not only will that have detrimental effect on the roads but on the proposed houses too.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/764  Respondent: 8790529 / Nigel Carter  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The railway station whilst providing a good service, already has a good sized car park, which is always full during the week. As many people commute to London, a 67% increase in population will almost certainly lead to more people using the station. If this was in proportion, then the car park would not be able to cope. Also there is no scope to increase the size of this car park.

1. Public transport in the area is limited – the bus service is infrequent and would not be able to cope with an increase in public using the service.

1. It is likely though that most people will have a car, or more than one car. This will generate a huge increase in traffic and will have a knock on effect to other villages nearby such as Ockham, Clandon, and Effingham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/108  Respondent: 8792193 / Brian Wolfe  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **Infrastructure and delivery**

4.1. The Infrastructure and delivery section of the Local Plan sets out that the fundamental rationale of what is proposed to support the delivery of the Local Plan and in particular it is about the provision of the infrastructure needed to support the development. There are however serious deficiencies in the infrastructure as it is. The infrastructure does not adequately support what is already here.

4.2. In East Horsley:
4.2.1. The roads are in poor condition with many potholes, and are generally unable to sustain the current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;

4.2.2. The principal through roads traversing the village are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;

4.2.3. Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water or flooding when it rains;

4.2.4. The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult for example for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs; Because of poor road drainage road edges become flooded or turn into min streams and pedestrian are regularly covered in water as traffic passes by.

4.2.5. There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing to go to both Primary and Secondary schools with the result that children are often allocated to schools some significant distance away such as Dorking; Merrow; or Leatherhead

4.2.6. The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

4.3. It is recognised that, as stated in the Local Plan, that maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not Guildford Borough Council itself but is for example Surrey County Council or utility companies.

4.4. In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C: LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

4.5. HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.

4.6. There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools. Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

4.7. The issue of local primary schooling illustrates the issue very clearly. The 11 sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes, which are today served by a single primary school, i.e. The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guides suggest that this number will require the provision of around 150 new primary school places to accommodate such a population increase. Yet today there is no capacity at The Raleigh at all and no proposals are made in the Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s. It was suggested in a local planning application that primary school children will be expected to travel to Merrow for schooling yet even more traffic on the roads

More comment is made on the transport implication of the Local plan under a separate heading.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16499  Respondent: 8794753 / Andrew Beckett  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars;
2. The increased volume of car A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads;
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements;
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them);
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest;
6. The lack of suitable public The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3384</th>
<th>Respondent: 8796321 / Nick Etches</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <strong>I object</strong> to the fact that infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels – roads, doctors, schools will not be able to cope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. <strong>I object</strong> that housing being proposed on the Green Belt will increase traffic bringing increased danger and pollution and slower journey times on our already overcrowded village roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1474</th>
<th>Respondent: 8796481 / Sally Erhardt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the lack of provision of infrastructure.</strong> Who will be paying for the major infrastructure investment that will be demanded with such a high number of extra housing planned? There is no provision for this and with our antiquated, congested and over stressed position now there will be a terrible collapse in education, medical provision, energy, water, communications and transport systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3690</th>
<th>Respondent: 8796609 / Rupert Pye</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICIES A37, A38, A40 and A41, located in West Horsley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All these sites are located within Green Belt. These sites, plus two others, are proposing 405 homes in total. The village as a whole had 1124 dwellings in the 2011 Census and the proposed developments represent an increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormous expansion by any standards. This will completely adversely alter the nature of the village as a whole and will change it from a low density housing area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the additional dwellings, the local infrastructure will be unable to cope; in particular:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The local schools, both primary and secondary, are already completely full and would not be able to take additional children. This matter is not addressed in the local plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public transport is currently inadequate with poor bus services and station car parks that are already full.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local roads are also unfit for purpose being very busy and in poor condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The nearest medical centre, in East Horsley, is totally overstretched with appointments being difficult to obtain.
- There are only a couple of small shops in West Horsley with most residents doing their shopping in East Horsley village. Traffic and parking in East Horsley Village is already too great for the facilities.

For the above reasons I OBJECT to the above-named Policies.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2982</th>
<th>Respondent: 8796673 / Suzanne Burroughs</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming even more dangerous for pedestrians. There is a particular problem near the school which is being increased in size so perhaps more children will be walking and there will also be more cars at the south end of west clandon village.

Where the A247 is restricted in its width outside the house called “Summers” vehicles regularly go on to the pavement and often wing mirrors are also clipped by two vehicles passing.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

The summer of 2016 has been wet and so we have had no hosepipe bans. I worry that there is not sufficient water in the southeast area to supply more houses.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/95  **Respondent:** 8797537 / Shonagh Finnan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the lack of common sense being applied to this suggested plan insofar as our infrastructure cannot take many more houses. Schools are full, car parks are full already and the doctors’ surgery has a long appointment wait time. Also, what about the flooding in Horsley, at the moment not under control?

When I lived in Cobham I sometimes could not park at the shops and drove home again empty-handed. This is a sorry way to live.

I object to the suggestion of **traffic managing** in the Horsley area as with maybe 5000 more cars on the local roads we need full access to all the present roads to spread the traffic over the whole area not funnel everyone down the same route.

**Think again if you wish to retain your council seat. You will not be voted for again.**

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11794  **Respondent:** 8797665 / Sylvia Lillywhite  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

---
Drains are blocked, giving rise to local flooding.

The villages of East/West Horsley need a new school site. Traffic and parking for residents must be terrible during the school year, even people in the village cannot get places at the present time, it needs a 3 form entry school with better sports facilities available for the local residents to enjoy, and enhance the children’s learning experience.

The Medical centre is totally inadequate for the village. Only today I tried for an appointment at the surgery.....2 weeks to wait.

We need more parking for the Village Hall, too many commuters use it to avoid high charges in the car park at the station.

Another few hundred houses will swamp the already very well used businesses, although we have 3 hairdressers, 3 Estate agents, please no more of these given permission to start up.

A36 I hope the mail Chown building at Thatchers Hotel will be preserved when you build on that site, it is part of village history.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Policies ID1 & ID2 Infrastructure – My Objections**

Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits “…we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

**Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections**

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example The Street in West Clandon and Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and West Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2726  Respondent: 8798881 / H L Cousins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2736  Respondent: 8798881 / H L Cousins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8550  Respondent: 8799521 / David Donaldson  Agent:

We are writing to register our objection to a number of elements of the Guildford Local Plan Proposals concerning the Horsleys.

General concerns

My wife and I have lived in East Horsley for over twenty years and during this time we have witnessed a change from a rural environment to one more like an urban environment.

There has been a been a significant increase in traffic. This has put an immense strain on the roads and drains which now need constant attention and are always in a poor state of repair and are sometimes dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12749  Respondent: 8800545 / Bill Taylor  Agent:

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day) for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough's infrastructure is already heavily strained.

However the plan's determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number. The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of house building as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income.

It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all. Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed.

Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1757  Respondent: 8800705 / Michael Cumper  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to development in places where there is insufficient transport infrastructure when there are urban brownfield sites with access to this infrastructure of sufficient size to accommodate all the development needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4166  Respondent: 8801473 / Jerry Keane  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The drainage currently on Keens Lane is totally inadequate and its structure frequently causes flooding in Sime Close.

It is also well known that the sewerage is often seen bubbling up on to the road during periods of heavy rain.

Schools, hospitals, doctors and other essential services are at breaking point.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/907  Respondent: 8801953 / Sarah Relf  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to infrastructure policies set out in I1, I2 and I3

Infrastructure improvement proposals are inadequate even to meet current needs, let alone the new developments proposed in the Plan

In West Horsley, roads are in poor condition with frequent potholes. Many are unable to sustain even the current levels of traffic, particularly increasing levels of HGVs and online delivery vehicles. The principal roads through the village are narrow, winding lanes, with pinch points, sections without pavements, and are generally unlit. Many of the drains are blocked causing frequent surface water flooding when it rains. Pavements are in poor condition, often narrow, uneven and overgrown by adjacent vegetation. Local schools and the Medical Centre in neighbouring East Horsley are already operating at capacity

I sincerely request that GBC that radically reassess its own policy objectives rather than force through a Plan which clearly does not have the wider support of the residents of Guildford Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/5080</th>
<th>Respondent: 8802369 / Penny Panman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure Policies I1, I2 and I3: I object to these policies because they do not actually provide adequate planning for the improvement of infrastructure in and around East and West Horsley. I have particular concerns about the inadequacy of the narrow, winding lanes, the poor drainage and frequent flooding of these lanes, the pavements in poor condition and the low arched bridge on Ockham Road North which is regularly struck by large lorries. Local schools are already at capacity and there are no proposals to deal with this. The Medical Centre is also full and the proposal to expand it will not happen early enough. The station car parks are full every day. I do not believe that the infrastructure policies are adequate for the enormous scale of the proposed housing development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/1634</th>
<th>Respondent: 8802497 / P M Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a resident of East Horsley for the past 20 years, I am writing to express deep concern about the general thrust of the New GBC Local Plan, and in particular about the proposed assault on the existing Green Belt. A very large target number of new houses are being proposed – an actual increase from the previous plan, in spite of objections – and the knock-on effects of such development on a village that is already under severe pressure as regards traffic and parking, and access to local amenities, will materially damage the quality of life for its residents – and leisure visitors. There are, however, two aspects of the new plan which I particularly wish to highlight.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5  **Respondent:** 8803297 / Francesca Milone  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I'm a resident of Horsley Village and I would like to strongly object to your plans to build extensively on the area. The proposed plans will directly affect me and my family. I have two children who go to a nearby school and from drop off I commute to my work place via the A3. The traffic is appalling, the roads are dreadful and the sheer volume of work you're proposing just doesn't stack up given the infrastructure of our peaceful and beautiful village. My family and I moved here for it's connection with the "country life" whilst being accessible. But I would never have imagined that you would even entertain a proposition that would destroy everything Horsley and the nearby villages stand for. As an example of lack of infrastructure to support the plans...We called the doctors before 9am to get a same day appointment (appointments are released on the day) but none were available. This happened first hand TODAY! I took the train to work last week and the carpark was full as was the early train. People were standing as there were no seats available a few stops on. How do you expect to support an influx on people demanding these services. You will ruin this area and our lives as we know it if this goes ahead, even if chopped in half. I strongly urge you to reconsider.

Francesca Milone

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13834  **Respondent:** 8803713 / Ian Berry  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plan to add any significant number of home to the area, let alone 385. There is no infrastructure to cope with developments of this nature in either West, East Horsley, Ockham or Ripley, as follows:

- No room for extra kids at the local schools at infant, junior or senior level.
- The drainage is bad enough already without more homes to cope with. Thames Water has already advised GBC that it would not be able to cope.
- The roads could not cope with more traffic in rush hours – the Ockham Road is very busy with traffic using it to get to the A3 and M25. The A3 northbound is often totally jammed in the mornings with traffic coming onto it from this road. This then clogs up the M25 in both directions. I get stuck in it every morning so I should know! The Local Plan (including the proposed Wisley Development) seems to completely ignore this issue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4275  **Respondent:** 8804417 / Vivian and Philip Markley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plan to add any significant number of home to the area, let alone 385. There is no infrastructure to cope with developments of this nature in either West, East Horsley, Ockham or Ripley, as follows:

- No room for extra kids at the local schools at infant, junior or senior level.
- The drainage is bad enough already without more homes to cope with. Thames Water has already advised GBC that it would not be able to cope.
- The roads could not cope with more traffic in rush hours – the Ockham Road is very busy with traffic using it to get to the A3 and M25. The A3 northbound is often totally jammed in the mornings with traffic coming onto it from this road. This then clogs up the M25 in both directions. I get stuck in it every morning so I should know! The Local Plan (including the proposed Wisley Development) seems to completely ignore this issue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Infrastructure overload

Infrastructure in the Horsleys is already under pressure - schools are full, roads and parking are overloaded, drainage is inadequate, the medical centre is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/129</th>
<th>Respondent: 8804929 / Helen Beckett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Schools

There is only ONE state primary school in West Horsley and NO state secondary schools. The Raleigh School is already oversubscribed and many children living in West Horsley were NOT offered places at their local school in the last few years. There is already a problem here with a lack of places and this already needs resolving WITHOUT adding another 533 homes. How do you propose to deal with this??

Medical services

It is already difficult to get an appointment at Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, the ONLY surgery in East and West Horsley. You cannot dilute this service any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4103</th>
<th>Respondent: 8805249 / Peter Warburton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/422  Respondent: 8805249 / Peter Warburton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy D1 provides the general policy framework for infrastructure development in the borough proposed in the local plan, including the accompanying Infrastructure Schedule set out in Appendix C. Other than a few specific changes consequential on the removal of certain projects in the light of the reduced housing target, there are only minor changes made to the infrastructure proposals in the 2017 version of the GBC Local Plan. These changes totally fail to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure, nor meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments. Accordingly:

I OBJECT to the inadequate provision of infrastructure investment across the borough provided for in the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2367  Respondent: 8806305 / Laurence Cook  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I1 - Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT. Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in
residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5408  **Respondent:** 8807617 / Anne Heine-Carmichael  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

It is often difficult to park in Guildford and approaches impossible during the winter months.

We do not have the infrastructure to cope with any more building. Do we not have brown field sites which are not used? We build office spaces we don’t need, why not build affordable houses. But we don’t need or want whole new towns or villages.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5276  **Respondent:** 8810113 / Louise Stewart  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the Borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16533  **Respondent:** 8810849 / Charles Lee  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested.

These narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians AND you have given no consideration to this point.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16542  **Respondent:** 8810849 / Charles Lee  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16543  Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16641  Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16650  Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
I OBJECT to the local plan based on the impact it will have on the special countryside of the borough.

The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch (A43) will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15102  **Respondent:** 8811009 / Rosalind Gleeson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

Very little thought seems to have been given to problems of infrastructure (traffic, schools, hospitals etc) as they stand at the moment, never mind how they would be increased by such proposed new development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9302  **Respondent:** 8812097 / Clare Benzikie  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

**I OBJECT**, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

**I OBJECT** to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Such narrow roads mean that any increase in volume of traffic will end up as a permanent traffic jam.

The proposed school submitted for plans with an estimated number of pupils reaching 750 - 1000 could result in something like 800 additional car on the roads that at certain times of the day has already reached its maximum.

I object to these proposals because insufficient information has been given in order for the residents to make a proper assessment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16583</th>
<th>Respondent: 8813281 / P J Ryan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local schools are full. Medical facilities would find it difficult to cope. Drainage is inadequate. Roads are already overloaded and in a parlous state. Village car parking is already overloaded with no room for expansion. Railway Station Parking is already at capacity with no room for expansion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2760</th>
<th>Respondent: 8813601 / Gaenor Richards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the local plan, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure.

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2767  Respondent: 8813601 / Gaenor Richards  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7356  Respondent: 8814465 / Elizabeth Clinton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
To build hundreds of houses in the Horsleys is out of all proportion as there is no infrastructure in place to support this increased population. It is an infrastructure overload. Already the Raleigh School is over subscribed, the Medical Centre is oversubscribed, one can not get an urgent doctor’s appointment that day and our busy, pot holed, rush hour roads can not cope. The designation of Station Parade as a “District Centre” is wrong. It results from a complete misreading of the nature of the facilities in the village centre and would inappropriately target the area for future urban developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17077  Respondent: 8817377 / Mark Silcock  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4017  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to including the Wisley Airfield (A35) site in the Local Plan as the GBC Planning committee have already unanimously voted rejecting the proposed plan of 2,000 homes etc.

I object to including the Wisley Airfield (A35) site in the Local Plan as concerns have already been raised by authoritative sources such as Highways England, Thames Water, NATS and the Environment Agency.

I object to the huge development plans for the Wisley Airfield (A35) site as the surrounding infrastructure is unable to cope as it stands right now and would definitely fail with the addition of 2,000 houses etc. producing extra cars on the road, people at stations, children in schools, patients at health care units.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4019  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the proposed site allocation of Garlick’s Arch (A43) as it is an ancient woodland in a Green Belt protected area and should stay as such. Once destroyed it can never be replaced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4027  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the infrastructure requirements being ignored in the Send, Ripley, Clandon, Wisley and Gosden Hill areas. All the roads, medical facilities, public transport, schools etc. are already at full capacity and cannot be stretched any further.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6535  Respondent: 8817569 / Peter Davies  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

the infrastructure is already on overload, evidence by traffic levels and train services already running at full capacity. In addition to the proposed Horsley developments, the proposed 2,000 houses at Ockham on Wisley Airfield will also put huge additional demand Horsley’s infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3813  Respondent: 8817601 / A. L Thain  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With regards to the village of West Horsley, the proposal to increase the size of the village by 35% plus infilling (due to the proposed extension to the village boundaries) without any due regard or proposals for the replacement of the already full Raleigh school or how the doctors, car parks, railway station will cope is a complete dereliction of a Planning Officers duty. For instance you would not allow an individual house to be built without any proposals for parking so why are you floating your own rules and proposing to build 385 houses in one small village without any consideration or plans for how the infrastructure will cope?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The A247 through West Clandon is a real issue of concern as an "A" road with inadequate width, inadequate lighting and inadequate speed control.

Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. There are no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the villages and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from the proposed developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists directly as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. To wilfully add traffic load would be quite irresponsible.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street (A247) generally only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements as has happened most recently on 12th July 2016.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Without proper planning and funding for healthcare and other facilities, local services will be overwhelmed.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no consideration of provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1167  **Respondent:** 8818017 / Anita Hose  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The infrastructure is not suitable for the proposed number of houses. The doctors surgery is already overstretched and the schools would not be able to cope. The roads are too narrow and not designed for all the additional housing and traffic.

I hope that you will heed our wishes and not be swayed by outside influences.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4559  **Respondent:** 8818433 / Julian Masters  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A visit to the village would clearly demonstrate that our present roads are failing to meet current traffic requirements. In particular the A247 has pinch points in the centre of West Clandon village that requires lorries travelling in opposite direction to mount the pavement to pass. The present reply to a constructive local petition to address this problem effectively acknowledges the problem but says short of a "Black Water By Pass,, compulsory purchase order scheme nothing meaning full can be done! Many of us agree and it flies int he face of all logical thought for the 2016 Plan to suggest further development in *this* area and in particular Burnt Common and West Clandon parish.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16443  **Respondent:** 8818625 / Beth and Frank Fuller  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/493  Respondent: 8818753 / Chris Bussicott  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I can find no evidence in the plan that GBC have considered the infrastructure requirements necessary for such a dramatic increase in the local population. All local primary schools are fully subscribed, and I can see no proposals to create further capacity. I understand the current plans to redevelop the Howard of Effingham secondary school will only just provide sufficient additional capacity for the local children already making their way through the demographic profile towards secondary education. How many more children will 500+ new homes bring? 250? 500? 1000? Whatever the number, it is clearly going to be a large one and there is nowhere to educate them – and putting additional cars/coaches on the road to transport them elsewhere to school will probably gridlock our local roads. Why not build the houses where the capacity for education exists in the borough? The same applies to doctors and medical facilities. Where in the plan is there a proposal to enhance local services? How will people access these services if they are not local? In addition to children requiring education, the proposed new houses will contain adults requiring work. Where in the Horsley do the jobs for these people exist? Perhaps the planners think that they will be commuters. If so the planners haven’t attempted to travel from Horsley or Effingham Station in the rush hour. The station car parks are already full and the trains crowded even before they pull into our stations. There simply isn’t the room for hundreds more people. Perhaps the planners think that these new residents will drive to work and I understand that there is a proposal to build an additional A3 intersection in the area; perhaps the planners have included this in their proposals in an attempt to alleviate the local gridlock that the additional home owners will create trying to drive their children to non-existent local schools or themselves to work in jobs that aren’t in the area. If so, then these planners clearly haven’t travelled on the A3 northbound towards London or southbound towards Guildford recently, where the traffic is already at a crawl throughout the rush hour periods, even if it is on a rare day when the M25 is flowing adequately. And that brings me to the elephant in the room; the proposals for Wisley airfield. All of the objections raised above also apply there, but multiplied by four times as many proposed houses with a couple of miles of the Horsleys. Once again, no provision for schools, medical facilities, public transport, roads etc etc. This is a disastrous proposal that risks irreversibly damaging a truly beautiful part of Guildford borough. There is no evidence that the real impact has been thought through adequately, and those elected members and officers involved need to take a long, hard look at themselves and their motivations for putting forward what is so obviously a badly flawed plan. Instead, I urge you to revisit the possibility of brown field development, finding locations in the borough that offer the opportunity for local jobs, education and medical capacity, and transport infrastructure. This is not nimby-ism, this is simply asking you to address the GBC local plan in such a way that provides sustainable development without throwing up houses on unsuitable pieces of land, simply because they appear to be ‘underdeveloped’. You will have seen my letter raises a number of direct questions. I look forward to a detailed response to these so that I can better understand why GBC are promoting what appears to me, as a local resident, to be a simply terrible plan.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/878</th>
<th>Respondent: 8818753 / Chris Bussicott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I can find no evidence in the plan that GBC have considered the infrastructure requirements necessary for such a dramatic increase in the local population. All local primary schools are fully subscribed, and I can see no proposals to create further capacity. I understand the current plans to redevelop the Howard of Effingham secondary school will only just provide sufficient additional capacity for the local children already making their way through the demographic profile towards secondary education. How many more children will 500+ new homes bring? 250? 500? 1000? Whatever the number, it is clearly going to be a large one and there is nowhere to educate them and putting additional cars/coaches on the road to transport them elsewhere to school will probably gridlock our local roads. Why not build the houses where the capacity for education exists in the borough?

The same applies to doctors and medical facilities. Where in the plan is there a proposal to enhance local services? How will people access these services if they are not local?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/481</th>
<th>Respondent: 8819137 / George Pincus</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I do object to the removal of the extended village area from the Green Belt and the density of the Wisley Airfield proposal.

They remain against all the evidence of the ability of the local area to sustain access, transport and employment.

Even with planned new facilities accompanying this proposal is clear that the neither the A3 or the B 2039 can accommodate any more traffic.

Imagine the vehicles needed by 2000 plus homes on the Wisley site seeking employment outside the immediate area and their impact on a road network already over crowded.

The proposed density of the Wisley plan is therefore grossly out of proportion to the character of the villages of Ockham and Horsleys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure
requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/675  **Respondent:** 8820417 / Simon Marshall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

On infrastructure, the revised plan proposals do not address the additional strain on infrastructure despite the overwhelming objections on this subject in response to the previous consultation. In particular the wording of Policy IDI has been amended to give the impression that provision of adequate infrastructure will be enforced. However, this is not within the gift of GBC. but, in the case of the road network, by Surrey Highways and Highways England both of whom will be influenced by budgetary constraints elsewhere within their jurisdiction. Equally traffic impact assessments will be prepared, and paid for, by applicants and not by GBC and will therefore present a biased outcome in support of any development.

I object to the inclusion of all sites other than brownfield sites oil basis that that GBC will be unable to secure or enforce the provision of the requisite infrastructure provisions either by negotiation with developers or through other government agencies. Any development must be in current urban or brown field site areas where there is already an appropriate infrastructure provision.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/803  **Respondent:** 8820929 / A J Stuart  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

---
We are all keenly aware of the lack of school places locally and the stress that this causes local parents with many children not being offered their first, second or even third choice state secondary school. Within Horsley may local residents never manage to get their child a place at The Raleigh, with the majority of the new Reception intake each September coming from siblings and those who live literally within the local two or three roads. Others are forced to take to the roads, adding to the already busy local infrastructure to travel to alternative settings.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the number of proposed new houses

SHMA numbers should be generated by a mathematical model available for all to see.

Infrastructure in the Horselys already giving cause for concern - Local schools full. Travelling to other areas has impact on roads and is not desirable for primary school children. Schools are important for village communities.

- Roads and parking overloaded, walking difficult on uneven narrow pavements in bad repair.
- Roads in bad repair.
- Drainage is poor. Roads are awash every time it rains. Concern of flooding in many area.
- Station facilities poor.
- Little local work available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPP16/13155  Respondent: 8824609 / Richard Sands  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.
The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17047  Respondent: 8825057 / Merrow Residents' Association (Keith Meldrum)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I 1 and Appendix C - Transport Infrastructure - this has been reviewed in detail by Richard Jarvis BSc, MS, CEng, FICE, FCIHT, who is a qualified civil engineer, and expert in transport planning and his comments appear on the GRA website http://www.guildfordresidents.co.uk/

We can do no better than to quote from his report:-

1. The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the proposed submission local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have "an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF".

2. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the proposed submission local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

We are also very disappointed that nothing is said in the Local Plan about the need for a bus interchange so that anyone entering the town centre by bus can change from one bus to another without having to walk more than a few yards. This omission must be corrected.

We must also be mindful of other new development in the borough that may put additional pressure on our roads- for example the proposals from Surrey County Council for the expansion of Newlands Corner- a proposal that is hotly disputed by residents in Merrow.

Conclusion - we object to this policy since the additional traffic generated by the proposed developments would increase traffic congestion. This is unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1234  Respondent: 8825057 / Merrow Residents' Association (Keith Meldrum)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• We made some very specific comments in our July 2016 submission reflecting the views of Richard Jarvis BSE, MS, CEng, FICE, FCIHT who is a qualified Civil Engineer. Once again, we reflect his views on this version and in summary these are: -

• “In terms of its transport aspects the Plan cannot be regarded as sound. GBC has provided vivid descriptions of the conditions on the network today and the evidence is that these will be as poor, and in some cases worse, at the end of the plan period, even with the mitigation measures. Growth and infrastructure have to be better aligned. While the level of growth in homes in this latest draft plan is somewhat lower than that in the 2016 version, it is still substantial and growth is also planned outside the borough. The evidence provided indicates that congestion will be widespread on much of the highway network in peak periods, even with the proposed highway schemes and with the measures to encourage the use of public transport in place”.

• In particular and in addition we are concerned at Policy ID1 in that it states that the delivery of development may need to be phased to reflect the delivery of infrastructure and that the delivery of the infrastructure will be secured by planning condition and planning obligation. It is our clear view that this provision is far too weak and is a watering down of previous assurances provided by senior councillors.

• At the very least, the Local Plan should make it clear that the development of a site may not proceed until all elements of the infrastructure are agreed by Guildford Borough Council, that the developer has agreed and provided a satisfactory guarantee that these conditions will be met and that the essential elements of the agreed infrastructure will be in place to ensure that any additional traffic will not cause severe congestion in the locality.

• We object to Policy ID1 for the above reasons.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8459  Respondent: 8825377 / Jane MacIntyre  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Other reasons for my objection:

• The existing infrastructure of roads (which were designed for the age of the horse and cart) parking, transport, water, drainage and sanitation are inadequate for the population as it is now so would not cope with a 35% increase in the population.
• The local medical centre, shops and schools are already stretched.
• The car park at Horsley railway station is already full on weekdays with no capacity to increase the number of spaces. The station entrance is always congested at peak times with cars collecting and dropping off rail passengers.
• Expansion of the peripheral areas of the Borough would have a detrimental effect on Guildford town centre adding to the congestion and pressure already experienced in a centre designed for a population of 8,000.
• Housing and population expansion which ignore water supply and consumption cannot be sustainable given that the South East is an area of severe water stress.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2667  Respondent: 8825697 / Online imaging (Peter Gelardi)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The local infrastructure cannot support the several large 'strategic site' housing developments proposed in the plan and there is no convincing plan to upgrade this. This applies to roads, schools and sewage.

The traffic 'mitigation' schemes offered to date will only go a small way to mitigating the traffic problems that these developments will cause.

I live in Ripley and this plan, if implemented will lead to a significant reduction in the quality of life of me and the other 10,000 people who live in this part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6461  Respondent: 8825985 / Christina Appleby  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Raleigh school which serves both East and West Horsley is full every year and this has been the situation for many years.

There is evidence that the existing drainage infrastructure is not capable of dealing with current surface and waste water problems and this situation would be considerably exacerbated by concreting over large areas of green belt land to build the proposed new homes.

The local roads already get congested due to everyday local traffic and the proximity to the A3 and M25; the increase generated by the proposed new housing estates would be considerable as most households would have 2 cars, many 3.

Parking at East Horsley’s shops, Public Library, Medical Centre, railway station and village hall is getting more and more difficult and would be much worse if the villages’ population is increased by the occupants of 533 new homes.

Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, serving all of East and West Horsley and areas beyond, is always very busy and making appointments can often be difficult. The planned population increase (in excess of Government ONS forecasts) would put further pressure on these services.
Horsley station car park is always full on weekdays. An increase in village population will increase pressure on station parking and associated traffic to and from the station by commuters and drop off and pick up of school children going to and from schools in Guildford, Leatherhead and sometimes beyond.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5563  Respondent: 8826081 / Simon Wilcockson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the fact that infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels – roads, doctors, schools will not be able to cope;

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5573  Respondent: 8826081 / Simon Wilcockson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6773  Respondent: 8826145 / William Hewlett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7. Comments relating to Policy I1: Infrastructure and Delivery

I OBJECT to those parts of this Policy which relate to East and West Horsley:

Item 4.6.1 of the draft Local Plan states: “The timely provision of suitable, adequate infrastructure is crucial to the well-being of the borough’s population, and of its economy.” I completely agree with this, but the Plan does not adequately recognise the currently already overloaded infrastructure in West Horsley, nor suggest remedial action. These limitations mean that any further significant increases in housing are not acceptable.

Rather than increase housing, further investment by GBC (and partners such as Surrey) is needed in the Horsleys, in schools, medical facilities (the Medical Centre is at the limit of its capacity), roads, drainage, water supplies, public transport, car parking and youth facilities.

• Schools

The 3 schools in the Horsleys already cause considerable traffic problems and a further increase in school population cannot be supported. The local state primary school (The Raleigh School) serves East and West Horsley and is
oversubscribed - even children living in the Horsleys cannot all obtain a place. The Plan does not take account of the Raleigh’s current proposal to relocate to the site A41, already identified in the Plan, which seems entirely appropriate.

Similarly at secondary age the Howard of Effingham School is oversubscribed. The Surrey County Council is very aware of the problems there have been in allocating Horsley children to places, but the Plan also does not address the Howard’s proposals for relocation. If it were not for a number of children attending independent schools, the situation would be even more critical, but these independent schools contribute considerably to local traffic congestion at each end of the day. Youth facilities are also very limited.

- Road, Rail and Public Transport

The two roads through the Horsleys are narrow, without complete pavements, and are appropriate only for the current size and nature of the villages. Any significant increase in population would exacerbate transport problems - access to, and progress along, the A3 and A246 is slow especially during school term times. Further development in West Horsley would also exacerbate access problems to the A3 and M25. Congestion is already shown to impair air quality.

There is reasonable rail transport to London or Guildford, but at peak times it is necessary to stand for much of the journey to/from London and when there is disruption, passengers joining at Vauxhall or Clapham Junction may not even be able to board the train. Although South West trains is extending capacity this will quickly be overwhelmed if there is further housing development. Bus services in the Horsleys are extremely limited.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3128  Respondent: 8826177 / Charles Spence  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1 states that infrastructure ‘will be secured by planning obligation, planning condition, or from other infrastructure funding, including the Community Infrastructure Levy’. There are some significant problems with infrastructure:

- As previously noted, a significant proportion of the Borough’s housing development is focused on Wisley, Clandon and Horsley. Relevant proposed road improvements are focused on the A3 and £1 million for ‘East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023’. Given the number of new houses proposed in Horsley and significant impact of nearby development in Wisley and Clandon, it is clear that the plan has insufficient consideration for the traffic consequences in the neighbourhood. For example, Ockham Road North is already busy and narrow so could not accommodate more traffic without jeopardising vehicle and pedestrian safety.
- There are no suggested changes required to mains water, waste water, flooding and education in the Horsley area. I find it difficult to believe that all of these services have 35% spare capacity to cater for the proposed increase in housing.
- There is a vague hope that developers will contribute to resolving some of these issues at Wisley airfield at some point in the next fifteen years.
- It is proposed to expand Horsley Health Centre in 5 – 15 years from unidentified funding. How will health needs be met in the meantime?

This is all the equivalent of crossing one’s fingers and hoping it will somehow resolve itself through unknown contributions to CIL. I object most strongly to a plan that completely ignores significant infrastructure issues especially in those areas with the most proposed development.
In summary, I object to the plan for the reasons set out above. In particular I object to the extent of the proposed development in Horsley. This is exacerbated by extensive development nearby in Wisley and Clandon and does not provide adequate consideration for all aspects of the infrastructure.

Finally, I also note that the plan is very similar to that proposed in 2014 and ignores most of the comments received from the consultation at that time. I trust the Council will listen this time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1102  Respondent: 8826177 / Charles Spence  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Paragraph 2.10a clearly states that ‘pressure on infrastructure must be addressed’. However, there has been no substantive change in the Infrastructure policies to address this. Specifically, nothing has been put forward since last year’s consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites and thus meet National policy requirements.

Every home on the West Horsley sites will need a minimum of one car to enable residents to get to shops, medical centre, library and Horsley Station, regardless of how much pressure is applied to adopt cycling and walking as the preferred means of travel. Additionally education and health care provision will need to be expanded. There is no provision in the plan for any of this other than through a hope that the CIL will enable this. However, the CIL will not raise enough to do this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13383  Respondent: 8826369 / Tim Madge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13170  Respondent: 8826529 / Martin Barker  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. Policy 17.

I am particularly concerned with the transport infrastructure and what plans you have to address the serious traffic problems that already exist in the borough even before any additional houses are built.

You say that the key infrastructure needed to support plan delivery is provided in an infrastructure schedule at Appendix B. However when I look at Appendix B and in particular section 4, Rest of Guildford, the detail on transport intervention required is incredibly sketchy, bordering on non-existent. There are 7 interventions listed with no detail attached whatsoever. None of the interventions address the A322 or A320 or the B and C roads in the north-west sector of the borough which will be significantly impacted by the proposed developments in that area. It seems that the consideration given to the road infrastructure is totally inadequate for a Plan of such huge import.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18502  Respondent: 8826529 / Martin Barker  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am particularly concerned with the transport infrastructure and what plans you have to address the serious traffic problems that already exist in the borough even before any additional houses are built.

You say that the key infrastructure needed to support plan delivery is provided in an infrastructure schedule at Appendix B. However when I look at Appendix B and in particular section 4, Rest of Guildford, the detail on transport intervention required is incredibly sketchy, bordering on non-existent. There are 7 interventions listed with no detail attached whatsoever. None of the interventions address the A322 or A320 or the B and C roads in the north-west sector of the borough which will be significantly impacted by the proposed developments in that area. It seems that the consideration given to the road infrastructure is totally inadequate for a Plan of such huge import.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8064  Respondent: 8826593 / Gilbert McClung  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. Infrastructure- Transport (Policies I1, I2 and I3)

The words "Roads and Transport Infrastructure" are mentioned in Definitions under Policy I1 (Infrastructure and Delivery), but no detail for West Horsley has been found in any of the Local Plan documents, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). 5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of the identities of the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

2. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan.

3. Policy I3 provides that developers "will be expected" to propose and secure travel plans for their developments and contribute to transport arrangements for the able and Legally, this is meaningless- this proposed policy lacks 'teeth' and is unrealistic where development and major housebuilding companies are involved.

4. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13). The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.

5. Whilst Horsley station has frequent trains to London and Guildford seven days a week, the station car park is normally full on An increase in village population will increase pressure on station parking and traffic movements to/from Horsley station, to drop off/ collect travellers to London and school children going to Guildford and Leatherhead.

4. Infrastructure- Schools and Medical Facilities (Policy 11)

I object to the lack of coherent proposals relating to schools and medical facilities for the Horsleys.

• There is a continuing lack of state primary school places in the The Raleigh School which serves both East and West Horsley is full every year and this has been the situation for many years. Secondary school places are limited in number at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools involve a much longer journey of time and distance from the Horsleys to reach them. Glenesk and Cranmore private schools are well supported by many families living in Guildford and other villages up to 14 miles away. Each of these private schools during term time, receives high volumes of traffic going to and from each school at each end of the school day, on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively.

• Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, serving all of East and West Horsley and areas beyond, is always extremely busy and residents experience difficulty in making The planned population increase (in excess of Government ONS forecasts) for the borough will require a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to cope.

5. Infrastructure- Waste Water (Policy I1)

I object to the lack of coherent proposals relating to waste water infrastructure for the Horsleys. These words receive a mention in Reasoned Justification under Policy 11, but no detail for West Horsley has been found in any of the Local Plan documents, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

• There are known sewage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North I Green Lane
• Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area's wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advises 'a 2 to 3 years lead-in period' to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6102  Respondent: 8826913 / Gemma Harrison  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4923  Respondent: 8827489 / Karen Bradshaw  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure

In many aspects the infrastructure of the Horsleys is already overloaded. Local Schools are full, the medical centre is stretched, drainage is inadequate. Traffic and parking are already an issue and at high levels. There is little scope for improvement currently and the scale of development proposed is completely out of all proportion to the facilities available and the ability to increase those facilities. I note that in the proposal for 2000 houses on Wisley airfield they identify Horsley station as a transport link. Anyone who has bothered to visit Horsley will know that the station car park
is already at near capacity. There is no provision in the Local Plan to improve this infrastructure in proportion to the proposed building.

I urge the Council to revisit the housing number, utilize brownfield sites for housing not commercial development rather than green fields and to live up to their election commitment to protect the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2993  Respondent: 8827809 / Robert Wood  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure.

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the K2.47 through West Glandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Glandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as WEst Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Glandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough's infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan's determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic.

It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12024  Respondent: 8827841 / Christine David  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
No provision has been made for the infrastructure deficiencies that the proposed level of development must create.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8566</th>
<th>Respondent: 8828353 / Claire Richards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the large number of proposed homes within the parish boundaries on a number of grounds, as the numbers are too high and unsustainable for the future. A thriving population will only survive if the correct infrastructure is in place to start with. The areas of infrastructure required are, not limited, to the following:

Schooling: There is limited state primary schooling in the Horsley’s with the Raleigh School over subscribed with a waiting list even for children within the village. Secondary school places are limited at the Howard of Effingham School. There are private primary schools available but families outside the village boundaries also support these. Adding to congestion on the main arterial roads.

Medical facilities: The medical Centre in Kingston Avenue is always busy and it has been difficult making appointments in the past. The increase in population will only add to this pressure. Parking at the Centre is also limited. The nearest main hospital – The Royal Surrey, would also require major expansion to cope with the increased population within the borough.

Access to essential facilities: There is one small grocers store at the southern end of the village, which may close later this year due to retirement of the owner. However, even now the parking is limited.

Many people use the shops and library in East Horsley that has been designated in the plan as a ‘District Centre’. This is a complete misreading of the facilities in the village centre. Parking has already become increasingly difficult and these facilities will be woefully inadequate to support the proposed increase in population.

Roads and Transport Infrastructure –Policy I1, I2 and I3

Transport: Listen to the local traffic news any day of the week and there are issues on the A3 into Guildford. As someone who travels up the A3 daily to Teddington, I can speak from experience to say the road is busy from Ockham Park up to the M25 at 6:30 every morning. Where do you think all these extra people are going to work? The majority of them will travel on the A3 in either direction causing extra congestion. The condition of the local roads which will need to support this extra traffic, Long Reach, Ockham Road North and the A246 are in need of repair and Long Reach in particular is in no state for extra traffic and would be difficult to widen due to the established trees along its length.

Whilst the trains run a frequent service to both London and Guildford, access to the station car park is hazardous and the parking on a weekday can be limited.

We are a two-person household but can sometimes have three cars at the property when the work vehicle is being used. We do have sufficient parking for this to be possible on site. However, looking at the density of the proposed build this amount of off-street parking is unlikely to be available to the new builds and the extra vehicles will add considerable pressure to the local roads. Parking on my road has become crowded and unsightly in the 3 years we have lived at the property. This is only likely to get worse across the village with the proposed developments.

Waste Water Infrastructure is inadequate with frequent flooding of gardens and roads. It takes me approximately 30 minutes to drive to work in good conditions. However, on Christmas Eve 2013 it took me 4 hours to get back due to flooding. The flooding remained a problem and delayed my daily commute for more than a month.

- Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advises ‘a 2 to 3 years lead-in period’ to install the necessary wastewater network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6512  Respondent: 8828385 / Thomas Meredith  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the total ignorance of infrastructure requirements. Roads, medical facilities, schools etc. will not be adequate to cope. They are all at full capacity now.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3724  Respondent: 8828417 / Valerie Wild  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy 11 - Infrastructure and delivery

OBJECT. There is a hopeless mismatch between the housing aspirations and infrastructure. Apart from a few hopes around the A3 junctions, nothing is suggested that might help in any material way. This is true throughout Guildford but particularly in the NW sector. In 2011, Guildford was labelled the 42nd most congested city in Europe. There are already serious problems with the A3 and the local roads, of which the northwest sector with the A320, A322 and A323 is probably the worst. But still there are sites in the plan for this sector. See in particular site A22, Keens Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11101  Respondent: 8828545 / Anjali Mittal  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
that this could provide land for additional housing. If this were to happen, it would give an extremely beneficial opportunity to provide an alternative pedestrian route from East Lane to the Railway Station avoiding the use of the Ockham Road. With rain, the latter is frequently running like a river because of inadequate drainage creating a water splash from passing vehicles that is difficult to avoid. Commuters in the dark evenings are especially vulnerable. The speed of passing vehicles, many of commercial size, can also be of concern given the limited width of the road.

I hope you will find these views helpful.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14744  Respondent: 8831393 / John Dumbleton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As anyone who driven on the roads around Guildford in peak times can see, the cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in draft Local Plan will be to increase congestion even with the proposed highway schemes in place. I therefore dispute the conclusion that the developments would have ‘an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF’. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that would be caused by the growth anticipated in the draft Local Plan. Congestion would only worsen; the network would lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents; and minor roads would have to cope with a lot more traffic for which they are wholly unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17121  Respondent: 8831521 / Denis Coulon  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport. The local roads are small, narrow country roads, already threatened by the current level of traffic through Ockham, the Horsleys, Ripley and Effingham. Adding another several thousand residents to this road infrastructure would be totally unacceptable in terms of safety, pollution and added congestion. Walking and cycling along the roads would be even more dangerous than it already is. In addition, the local rail stations of Horsley and Effingham cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14970  Respondent: 8831809 / Ann Taylor  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
• **Infrastructure**: the draft Plan asserts that provision of appropriate infrastructure is at the heart of the Council’s strategy and that all new development will have appropriate supporting infrastructure. Yet this is manifestly not the case. There is no way that the A3, as it currently is, can take the strain of extra traffic from 4000+ new houses. It is already seriously over-congested and traffic slows to a crawl at several points during each day. The draft Plan talks about requiring developers to fund improved access for traffic from their new developments but the A3 is national, not local, infrastructure and the traffic demands of the developments proposed require very substantial new investment in a major traffic project, not just a few extra roundabouts. It would be irresponsible to press ahead with the Gosden Hill and Wisley developments without a firm commitment to major improvements to the A3. The draft Plan makes clear that, while such a project is on the Department of Transport long list, it is not yet a firm commitment and we won’t know before 2020 whether it will get on the next list of firm commitments and what the timing might be. With expectations of lower national growth and lower revenues for central government now, post-Brexit, projections for 2020 and beyond must be very uncertain. If there is to be any development along the A3 corridor it should be shelved until there is a firm commitment from DoT for a major upgrade. Otherwise, you condemn this area of the borough to about 20 years of gridlock.

The proposals for Garlick's Arch are another example of where infrastructure concerns have not been properly examined. The idea of making a 4-way junction here off the A247 is seriously flawed. There is no way that the A247 through Clandon village could be a sensible feeder road for a junction of this size. There is a serious pinch point in the centre of the village which is unpassable if 2 lorries are coming in opposite directions. Lorries regularly mount the pavement which is well-used at certain times of day with children being walked to the village school. It is already an accident waiting to happen and the Council is aware from e-petitions and protests about the strength of concern in the village about it. To propose actually increasing traffic through the village is unthinkable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** pslp171/2215  **Respondent:** 8831809 / Ann Taylor  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• **Road Infrastructure**: the draft Plan acknowledges that new developments have to be supported by appropriate infrastructure but the cumulative impact of the developments mentioned above on both the A3 and the A247 is not recognised.

A247: there are already serious traffic issues in our village, notably at the pinch point in the heart of the village (and only a 100 yards or so from the school) where two cars can pass but not wider vehicles. Residents of the village have been vociferously urging traffic calming measures for some years now. The road cannot realistically support any significant increase in traffic, let alone the very major impact from the Burnt Common and Garlick’s Arch developments which will inevitably send a lot more traffic through the village, increasing both domestic and more particularly commercial traffic given the nature of the new proposals for Burnt Common. Some of the commercial traffic will be very large vehicles given what is proposed for the latter site and will be dangerous when negotiating the pinch point. The 4-way junction being considered for the A3 at Burnt Common will not alleviate any of these problems but simply further increase traffic through the village, in particular from the Gosden Hill development which is to be linked directly to the A3.

A3: the draft Plan recognises the pressure already on the A3 through Guildford, although it seem to seriously underplay the throttling impact this road has on the town on a regular basis – only today I have spent half an hour in gridlocked traffic for no apparent reason other than the volume of traffic feeding into the 2-lane section. Getting developers to finance the local infrastructure to join up developments to the A3 is not going to improve the flow of traffic on the A3 itself: it can only increase the pressure on it. It is hard to believe that 4 major developments are being proposed along a road which is already over-stretched.
There should be no commitment to such a huge increase in traffic volumes unless there is a correspondingly firm commitment from Highways England to a major upgrade to the A3 to support the development and to ensure that Guildford is not overwhelmed with traffic delays.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4350  **Respondent:** 8832513 / Richard Russell  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

All of our local Schools are already full, our Medical facilities are already overstretched and our village Parking facilities (including the railway station and local shops) are already inadequate with no space for improvement. All local roads are narrow and were built at a time when the stage coach/ pony & trap were the typical mode of transport rather than today’s 4x4’s, long-wheel courier vans and supermarket delivery vehicles. Much of the Horsleys are built on clay with the consequence that drainage is inadequate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2242  **Respondent:** 8833857 / Gail Cook  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this proposal. Improvements to infrastructure should be properly coordinated and planned before development is considered, not led by developers gaining planning permission piecemeal. If insufficient improvements can be made development should not go ahead. Constraints to development should carry more weight.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: pslp171/431  **Respondent:** 8834049 / Dana-Leigh Strauss  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**OBJECTION 3: PARKING**

Parking is already constrained in the village. Currently, builders, visitors, people making deliveries, etc., park on pavements, obstructing the use of pavements by pedestrians and cyclists. This creates creating potential dangers because pedestrians and cyclists are having to go onto the road as the pavements are blocked by cars and trucks. This situation continues to worsen with the number of houses currently in West Horsley.
OBJECTION 4: TRAFFIC

The increased traffic as a result of the further developments will result in increased congestion and further compromise the quality of life in the area.

OBJECTION 5: INFRASTRUCTURE

The current infrastructure, with respect to roads, public transport, schools and medical services (to name a few) cannot cope with current level of housing. What is being proposed will only exacerbate the situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17407  Respondent: 8834689 / of NLP Ltd c/o Solum Regeneration (Dennis Pope)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We support the LP's intention to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to support the development needs. We support the approach of this policy, save for the priority given to the Thames Basin Heath SPA over all other site specific contributions, as this absence of flexibility is inconsistent with the Council's approach to all other S106 obligations. It is appropriate for the Council to review its current SPA policy through this LP, in accordance with the NPPF and the weight it attaches to, for example, sustainability, economic considerations and housing delivery.

Draft Policy P5 contemplates situations where the integrity of the SPA may be protected through different liner thresholds or alternative mitigation measures and the reasoned justification to the policy that the Council's established precautionary principle may be reviewed by its JSPB in the future. Furthermore, the legal requirement, enshrined in European Law, may well change as a consequence of the UK leaving the European Union.

We therefore suggest that the fourth para of Policy 11 be deleted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/636  Respondent: 8835105 / Margaret.R Sawers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Despite the concerns of many residents living in East and West Horsley about the size of future housing developments little has changed in the present plan.

Still no thought has been given to the poor existing infrastructure to accommodate such a large development.

1 Existing schools cannot cope without the school population being greatly increased

2. Our Health Centre is already stretched as well as the fact that the Royal Surrey Hospital will find the extra size in population difficult to cope with.
3. Travelling arrangements will be greatly increased and parking in the village is difficult now without the thought of such a large number of extra cars entering the village.

4. The roads in the village have difficulty now coping with the volume of traffic. The thought of the development alone on Wisley Airfield and traffic from there through our villages as well as onto junction 10 of the M25 road is more than worrying.

5. Our local roads in particular East Lane, which I have raised for more than two years about the terrible condition it is in has been ignored. Difficult as it is for motorists to navigate I almost saw a cyclist fall off two days ago. This road also suffers from flooding when we get a lot of rain.

My concern is that once the villages of East and West Horsley are removed from the green belt little by little large developments will happen and future generations will not thank us for allowing this to happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8302  Respondent: 8835425 / Martin O'Hara  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

INFRASTRUCTURE

West Horsley is a small village with few local facilities. There is currently just one shop at the southern end of the village, where local car parking is very limited. Most people in West Horsley already have to travel, largely by car, to East Horsley for their day-to-day shopping, banking and health needs. The existing car parking facilities in East Horsley are already at capacity and any increase in the local population will only add to the existing problems. Any new development would not “support the continued viability” of the existing village infrastructure, as has been said by GBC in the past. In my opinion it would only serve to overload the same beyond breaking point!

State educational provision, both at junior (The Raleigh) and senior (The Howard of Effingham) school level, is already under strain and has been a thorny issue for Surrey County Council and the local community for some years. The Raleigh School, which endeavours to serve both West Horsley and East Horsley, is full every year and has been so for the twenty years that I have lived in the village. Its site is already fully developed and the opportunities for any further expansion are limited.

Personally I also have some doubts as to whether or not further expansion, from two form entry to three form entry into a junior school, is the correct approach for young 5 year old school starters, but perhaps that’s a debate for another day. The Raleigh has however recently indicated to local residents that it does not feel that it can further increase capacity on its existing site and is considering its options for relocating, raising further concern about possible future erosion and harm to the Green Belt.

Secondary school places are already restricted in number at the Howard of Effingham School for children from West Horsley and all other available secondary schools are considerably further afield in either Guildford or Woking. Potential residential development in Effingham and Bookham will only further exacerbate the problems for local West Horsley children, as children from these proposed developments would, by being physically closer to the school, have priority of entry. This, however, could then have the repercussion of pushing West Horsley children out of its potential catchment, with no currently sustainable local alternative.
I note that a new junior school and senior school is now being proposed at the former Wisley airfield development site, although this would not be delivered (if ever) until well into the plan period and certainly significantly after the currently proposed residential development in West Horsley is well underway or, indeed, completed.

In the Independent school sector, both Glenesk and Cranmore private schools are supported not just by local Horsley families, but also by many families from Guildford and other surrounding villages, some travelling quite some distance. In term time each of these schools significantly contributes to the local traffic problems on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively.

The Horsley Medical Centre is already at capacity, as it serves both East and West Horsley, and any additional residential development would necessitate an expansion of this facility. Possible future extension is mentioned in the Draft Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 but sparse detail, save for an envisaged timescale, is given. This is again unacceptable.

Furthermore, the proposed explosion in population (well in excess of Government ONS forecasts) within the borough will also put further strain on the Royal Surrey Hospital and its ability to cope must be questioned too.

Finally, I also believe that the existing utilities infrastructure in the area would be further stretched, probably beyond acceptable limits.

Surface water drainage along East Lane has been a continual problem for many years throughout the autumn and winter months. The addition of further built environment and associated hard landscaping would only exacerbate these problems. The area encompassing West Horsley has already been identified and acknowledged by GBC within the map on page 22 of the Draft Guildford borough Infrastructure delivery Plan 2016 as being, by some distance, the borough’s single largest Surface Water Flooding Hotspot Location. One can only further question the flawed GBC logic of proposing such large numbers of new homes in West Horsley without apparently even addressing the potential flood issues that could be exacerbated by such hard landscaping that would inevitable ensue.

Furthermore, I understand that Thames Water have already advised GBC that the area’s water network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the local developments. Water pressure in the area is already poor.

Finally, I also understand that there may also be a serious under capacity of existing foul water sewers. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will, I understand, all need to be upgraded to cope with the increased demand. Thames Water has apparently advised that a two or three year lead-in period will be needed to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for any significant development is granted. Unfortunately I’m sure that housing developers will not be waiting that period before they want to build / sell their new houses! This is clearly unacceptable and again shows a flaw in the proposals put out for consultation by GBC.

I note that GBC states in Item 4.6.1 of the Proposed Local Plan that “Timely provision of suitable, adequate infrastructure is crucial to the well-being of the borough’s population, and its economy. Guildford Borough Infrastructure baseline 2013 summarises the capacity and quality of existing infrastructure, including planned improvements. Historically infrastructure provision and upgrading has not always kept pace with the growth of population, employment and transport demands, and in parts of the borough some infrastructure is currently at, or near to, capacity or of poor quality.” I have no doubt that West Horsley must fit into this category.

I was initially pleased to note that Policy II: Infrastructure and delivery; states its aim as being “To support delivery of this Local Plan, infrastructure needed to support development should be provided and available when first needed to serve the occupants and users of the development...”. However it then goes on to say “where the timely provision of necessary supporting infrastructure is not secured, development may be phased to reflect infrastructure delivery, or will be refused.”

I don’t think that GBC can have it both ways. Either it is to be provided and available when first needed or it’s not. I think that the policy wording proposed should be reconsidered.
I would ask for an AMENDMENT to the first paragraph of the Policy 11: Infrastructure and delivery; so as to read “We will ensure that infrastructure needed arising from a proposed development is provided and available when first needed to serve the occupants and users of the development and so as to ensure that no adverse impact or reduction in capacity is suffered by the existing residents of the settlement. This will be secured by planning obligation, planning condition, or from other infrastructure funding, including the Community Infrastructure Levy.” I would ask that the final sentence of this paragraph be deleted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8309  Respondent: 8835425 / Martin O'Hara  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally, any significant new housing in West Horsley, and certainly anything like the extent proposed, would necessitate vast improvements to existing infrastructure, including education and health provision, roads, drainage and water services. If the development proposals are adopted, in part or whole, advanced provision of such facilities and capacity improvements must be a pre-condition of any such development. Local services cannot support any such development without its prior provision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13862  Respondent: 8835553 / David Pile  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no proposed development of other facilities to accompany the massive proposed increase in houses. Most will probably have at least two cars per household.

- This increase in vehicles will have an adverse impact on already inadequate roads, and other services. The Raleigh School is proposing to relocate to a green field site and, one assumes, (although their information letter does not mention it), to take more pupils. They claim this new location will alleviate traffic congestion, but this will only be in Northcote Road/Crescent, and Nightingale Avenue/Crescent. There will be even more traffic that at present in East Lane and Ockham Road North. (I am interested to read that a recent planning application for a school in Effingham has been turned down).

- These additional householders will generate additional traffic. There is already insufficient space at the railway station for commuters cars, and there is no room there to create additional parking. Where are these commuters to park?

- There is already insufficient space at the shopping precinct for shoppers cars, and there is no room there to create additional parking. Where are these shoppers to park?

- The doctor's surgery will be overwhelmed. I already have to wait one week for an appointment to see a GP, and longer if I wish to see a specific GP.
• The additional housing will create problems with rain drainage. The area is already subject to flooding in the frequent 'once in 100 years' deluges that we now seem to be experiencing every two or three years.

• If the proposed development of Wisley Airfield goes ahead these problems will made even worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15780  Respondent: 8836129 / Roger Shapley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The Council’s methodology assessing traffic and roads infrastructure needs is inadequate. It identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The local plan states no objective for congestion.

The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsuitable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7087  Respondent: 8837313 / Maria Baker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7088</th>
<th>Respondent: 8837313 / Maria Baker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Extending the Boundaries and making the Horsleys a town is beyond me – we have pretty country villages here. It’s just not feasible considering all the infrastructure that would be needed. I can’t imagine how this can be done as there is always a waiting list for the Doctors, excess parking for the station, overload in the schools. The topic is a complete waste of resources!

The condition of our roads is appalling with pot holes etc, and the intention to overload them even more is madness.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---


Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery.

Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem.

The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.
This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceeding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable.

The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints.

The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model.

Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods.

Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan.

The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network.

It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below.

In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5...indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton.

The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have ‘an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF’.

Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in...
which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided.

The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR:

Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road /Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3)

Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8).

Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14)

Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction.

Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction).

Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane.

Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17923  **Respondent:** 8839105 / EHK Jones  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
4.6 Infrastructure Policies

Development on the scale proposed within East and West Horsey would have a significant impact on the infrastructure of the villages.

The road and rail networks cannot sustain the influx of people in such numbers. The roads, as previously stated are effectively lanes, with often limited pavements and the parking at both Effingham and Horsley station is at capacity with no opportunity for expansion.

Flooding is already a concern in the village and comments from Thames Water have raised doubts as the ability to expand the waste water network.

Existing community facilities, such as the Medical centre are at capacity and local schools are over-subscribed. Indeed the development proposals close to The Raleigh School would inevitably mean that significant parts of our community wouldn’t have access to their local primary school.

We object to this Policy.

In conclusion, we believe that our community needs appropriate, demand driven housing, for example to enable older residents to downsize thereby freeing up much needed family housing in the area. A development, similar to Frenchlands Gate would enable this to happen. The Thatchers site would be appropriate but the density of housing stock proposed is significantly in excess of that currently (8.1 per hectare) and so would need to be addressed.

Some housing is inevitable and can be absorbed by existing communities but the scale proposed in our area by The 2016 Local Plan is disproportionate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12712  Respondent: 8839553 / David Burnett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of consideration for infrastructure overload in the Local Plan.

GBC’s Transport Assessment was not even available to councillors before the vote taken to approve the current draft of the Local Plan. It was only published several weeks after the draft of the Local Plan was approved. The pressures placed on infrastructure by the developments proposed in the Local Plan have not been given adequate consideration. Approximately 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt, within 1 to 2km of the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity. This will severely affect the quality of life of existing and new residents and it is highly irresponsible and unprofessional to develop a Local Plan without appropriate medical, education and transport infrastructure in place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/712  Respondent: 8839745 / Ripley Parish Council (Suzie Powell-Cullingford)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
In essence these proposals would lead to clear coalescence between the villages of Ripley, Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common. The traffic utilising our rural road network is already at capacity during peak hours and simply will not cope with the proposed additional residential and industrial sites, irrespective of the proposed new A3 slip roads adjoining the Garlicks Arch site. Any additional traffic travelling in an East/West direction will not be sustainable, in particular HGV vehicles and the enormous articulated lorries required by Travelling Showpeople.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13416  Respondent: 8840033 / Jimmy Daboo  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY II

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. This will increase the risk of serious accidents.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon where I live, already suffer from intolerable traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. As I say above my daughter who uses an electric wheelchair and often visits complains about the danger.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to
build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network, phone and broadband and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital; where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Worryingly, the Plan now has even less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure? It is clearly impossible to go ahead with the proposed developments absent guarantees that appropriate infrastructure is in place.

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

**Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections**

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

You will recall that in prior responses I explained that my wheelchair-bound disabled daughter often visits us and travels from Clandon station to our home along the A247 and that any increase in traffic ill increase the danger to her in making that journey. I see no attempt to deal with this point.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7801  Respondent: 8840193 / David K Reynolds  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Council Leader has promised that no development will take place without improvement in the infrastructure, this must come first. The infrastructure is overloaded, drainage is inadequate, the roads and car parks are overloaded with little scope for improvement. Both the local schools and the medical facilities are full.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9475  Respondent: 8840321 / Dorothy R Freeman  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Are planners not aware that local amenities are already stretched to capacity: schools, medical facilities etc? Also that our local roads at certain times are already, not only very congested, but in a shameful, third-world state. Hundreds more cars would be a nightmare.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/730  Respondent: 8840353 / Brendan McWilliams  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Policies ID1 & ID2 Infrastructure – My Objections

Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits …“we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic
The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

**B.5. Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections**

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle width in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
-is largely unlit
-has a primary school
-is already very congested at times

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13188  Respondent: 8840449 / David Wilson  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery

13.1. I OBJECT to the Plan making proposals for areas of development without simultaneously having the necessary information on the existing infrastructure (or lack of it) and associated costs of improving it, which is a necessary element of information in the decision making process. Consequently I submit that the Plan is severely flawed.

13.2. When you do eventually gather this information you will find in relation to East and West Horsley that it is already creaking in terms of capacity for school places, medical facilities, parking at the station, drainage, flooding of roads (including Ripley Lane and access to the Ockham/A3 roundabout) and the sewage network (particularly Pincott Lane where we have to call out the sewage company about every 6 months to make repairs to the mains sewage). There are also sewage problems in the Ockham Road North and Green Lane area. Any material volume of additional housing will necessitate major infrastructure upgrades.

13.3. The policy regarding schools is too vague. In West Horsley there is a lack of state primary school places. There are long journey times to secondary schools. There are high volumes of traffic to the two private schools, Glensk and Cranmore.

13.4. West Horsley uses the “Horsley Station” at East Horsley. This station car park is already full during week days, and will not cope with the increased housing proposed in the Horsley area, but also at Wisley Airfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10782  Respondent: 8842433 / Wendy Osorio  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

fail to understand how anyone involved in this plan who presumably has been out and visited the proposed areas (hopefully more than once) has realised that the infrastructure of this area simply cannot absorb any more traffic - it is almost a physical impossibility to get through Ripley at certain times of day, the queues which back up from Guildford along the A3 are getting worse almost daily and the more local roads such as mine which is Tithebarns Lane is a race
track and as such, extremely dangerous at busy times with cars and lorries driving at speed and using the road as a shortcut to avoid Ripley. The bridge over the stream next to my house is not wide enough to accommodate two vehicles passing and when a school bus, lorry or tractor are involved, it is worse.

The parking at Clandon station is almost impossible - to arrive to a totally full car park is unacceptable. The next station is either London Road or Guildford mainline both of which can take a considerable time to get to and frequently the same problem awaits - where do you propose the extra residents from new houses go? Medical facilities the same - the Villages Medical Centre is very well run and efficient but cannot do the impossible and increase their patient intake and continue to provide the same level of service to the community. A similar issue will arise with schools in the local area.

It appears that when a landowner who owns land alongside a road such as the A3 or in an area that is deemed to need a certain amount of new housing, and essentially has had enough and wants to sell, he works with a developer and they put together a plan that not only has colossal benefits to themselves, they also seem able to come up with a proposal that the council in turn finds irresistible because a promise is made to include something that will "benefit" the community.

I sincerely hope that this Plan may be re-considered and the many points that will inevitably be raised, become resolved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18192  Respondent: 8843361 / Adrian Atkinson  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I object** to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery

Everybody is clear, Guildford is struggling with its current infrastructure, its old, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to expanding the borough by 25% will mean major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for and has no guarantee of delivery in the duration of the plan.

The plan targets greenfield site which require large infrastructure investment in order to generate income to the council necessary to meet an existing infrastructure shortfall prior to the new houses being built. This is like companies banking income from the following year in the current year to balance the books – it is foolish at best, illegal at worst. The way the CIL is structured also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield as the rates are cheaper for developers. This is against the strategy of Brown Field first.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place and He will not be looking at what is possible until at least 2018. With current financial issues with Brexit, big new developments against a back-drop of declining economy is Eastern Promise. However they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.
This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. The council are not in control of this as it is based on outside funding from developers. The plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints.

The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Schools & medical facilities

I object to the plan on the grounds of the impact to local schools, which are already at capacity. No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/875  Respondent: 8845729 / John.P Burge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure. Many of the villages in the GBC area suffer from a lack of infrastructure. Examples of this are roads and bridges which are no longer adequate for the volume of traffic, pavements which are too narrow, schools which are full to bursting, drains which are never cleared, which fill up and overflow into the roadway. There are plenty more examples but GBC's plans always fail to address these issues before considering the impact of additional housing.

I OBJECT to the failure of GBC to deal with infrastructure issues before embarking on grandiose housing schemes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/414  Respondent: 8845729 / John.P Burge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The lack of any infrastructure development in East Horsley and the surrounding area is a major problem and the cause of so much opposition to new housing schemes.

I OBJECT to the lack of infrastructure support which is needed before any further substantial housing development in East and West Horsley, Ockham and the surrounding area is considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1291  Respondent: 8845825 / John Gould  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
n the first place, Guildford itself is quite unable to cope with its own traffic problems particularly in the North-South direction – although the A3 past Guildford leaves much to be desired.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4092  Respondent: 8846177 / Moira Tailby  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The problems that would arise are considerable – I list a few:

• The increase in traffic congestion and pollution. There is no detail given in the GLA 2016 for the improvement of the traffic management.
• Increase in pressure on parking spaces at the station, shops, surgery and village hall. Residents already have problems finding a place to park when using local facilities. If we cannot park, we will not use the local shops or attend lectures and events at the village hall. Here again the Guildford Local Plan 2016 does not provide a solution.
• The local schools are already full.
• Thames Water has stated that the existing drainage system would need to be upgraded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/680  Respondent: 8846529 / Vera Bulbeck  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• The secondary school which is earmarked for 1,500 pupils is not necessary. To build another school even if it does not cost GBC for the building, being a sweetener from the developer, it costs the taxpayer to run the school. There are already two secondary schools in Guildford that have vacancies in both schools, along with a number of other schools which have vacancies. The local GP surgery cannot cope at the moment; I have to wait four weeks to see my doctor at the present time. There is no point saying get more doctors as there is already a shortage of doctors. The local services will not be able to cope either.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5341  Respondent: 8846849 / David Berliand  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.

The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.

1. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
2. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
3. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.
4. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/676  Respondent: 8847393 / Tony Pratt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Little practical weight appears to have been given to the demands on an already overloaded infrastructure. There is a blithe assumption that much of the infrastructure needs can be financed by individual developers whereas it is the nature of many of the larger infrastructure projects which would be necessitated that they would require early funding and could not be easily linked to individual projects the timing of which will be staggered.

The housing targets seem unnecessarily aggressive compared with projected population trends.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12093  Respondent: 8848641 / Helen Feary  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to The Infrastructure proposals for the following reasons: i1

Schools: In the Horsleys, there are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in
the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsleys.

Secondary school places are limited in number at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools involve a much longer journey of time and distance from the village to reach them. Ockham Road North and the A246 are already congested with traffic at the beginning and end of the school day, and if parents have to drive long distances to other schools this will become unmanageable.

There is no new provision made within the Draft Local Plan and its supporting evidence to address this, which as a parent I find totally unacceptable.

Medical facilities: It is already difficult to get an appointment at the Medical Centre in East Horsley. The doctors have tried to accommodate residents by opening at different times, and are doing all that they can. but with the level of development proposed they will no longer be able to operate effectively and we will see more and more people having to attend the Royal Surrey and Woking Hospitals walk in clinics. To my knowledge GBC has not put forward any plans to increase healthcare facilities in the villages or indeed to expand the Royal Surrey Hospital.

Other facilities: The shops and library in East Horsley have been designated in the plan as a ‘District Centre’. This is a complete misreading of the scale of the facilities in the village centre. It is one short row of shops. Parking is already difficult and will be woefully inadequate to support the proposed increase in population. If every new house has only one car, that would mean 3,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the Horsley Villages. That would have a severe impact on our local roads, including a potential increase in traffic accidents and higher levels of pollution, leading to detrimental effects on health and increased pressure on NHS facilities.

Transport: The traffic on the A3 into Guildford is already congested and it is often difficult to join the M25 at Junction 10 if you are travelling in the Heathrow direction. If all the new houses are built, the majority of the residents will need to travel to work and there seems to be no provision for managing this extra traffic., causing extra congestion.

Whilst the trains run a frequent service to both London and Guildford, the car parks are already full and the surrounding roads hazardous each time a train comes in.

Waste Water Infrastructure: This is inadequate in the Horsleys and the surrounding area, with frequent flooding of gardens and roads. The map within GBC Surface Water management Plan, 2014 clearly illustrates that the Horsley’s are the largest area within the Borough to be called a surface flooding ‘Hot Spot’. However, no provision is made within the Draft Local Plan to address this, and this area is not even mentioned as a cause for concern. GBC has a responsibility to direct development away from areas affected by flooding, and also to protect the natural flood plain.

In addition, Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough Council that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advises ‘a 2 to 3 years lead-in period’ to install the necessary wastewater network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.

I believe that the failure to address this issue is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan and I therefore OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3207</th>
<th>Respondent: 8850433 / Ian Doherty</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery. Whilst we support the general policy statements as presented, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give me cause for concern.

I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally in poor condition. As a senior sec councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: "East Horsley has lanes, not roads." East Horsley's 'lanes' are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV's now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;
- The pavements are in poor condition as well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Darking or Woking; and
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

Furthermore, I would observe that the traffic at the A3/M25 Interchange (Junction 10 of the M25) is already at a point where significant delays and congestion occur every morning. My personal experience is that this congestion has worsened significantly over the past few years. Whilst the plan references improvement to this junction, these may ease the current issues, but adding the housing proposed for the Horsleys, Wisley Airfield, Ripley and Send will likely result in no improvement, but rather worsening of an already unacceptable situation.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5-15 of the plan.
There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools. Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5-15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, EHPC believes that this needs to be done earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley's.

I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I accordingly OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I further OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

POLICY 14 Green and blue infrastructure is supportive of this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

-----

1. **Local Roads**: The roads are already in a poor state of repair and struggle to cope with the existing levels of daily traffic. At certain times of the day, several roads in the village are especially congested. Many local roads have no footpath or very narrow footpaths with the majority unlit. It can therefore be quite dangerous to use these footpaths, especially in winter and at night. There is absolutely no scope for additional roads or widening of roads due to existing houses meaning that the current problem will just be exacerbated if development on the scale suggested is allowed to take place. If it is assumed that every new home has at least 2 cars, this means that there will be, potentially, 6,000 more cars within a 3-mile radius of East and West Horsley. The impact on local roads will be horrendous.

2. **Public transport**: The West Horsley bus service is very limited and only operates 3 times per day, weekdays only and not at peak commuter times. The bus service operating from Guildford to Leatherhead travels along the A246 at the southern end of the village but is really only of use to residents living at that end of the village. Although the train service from Horsley to London and Guildford is generally good/frequent, parking at Horsley Station is already under significant pressure and the car park is often full. There is no land adjacent to the existing car park for additional parking. There is already a problem with rail passengers parking in the East Horsley Village Hall car park (thereby denying bona fide village hall users from parking there) and I would imagine this will only increase.

3. **Drainage/Flooding**: Little has been mentioned of the impact that development would have on the drainage and sewerage systems which are already wholly inadequate. The roads near where I live (Ockham Road North and East Lane) regularly flood after heavy rain and the whole area is at serious risk of flooding. In particular, the
site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is, in places, a level 3 flood risk area with local residents often having standing water in their gardens after rain. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem.

4. **Medical Facilities**: The single medical practice in East and West Horsley is already heavily over-subscribed and it is very difficult to get an appointment.

5. **Schools**: The same comment applies to schooling in the area with both local primary and secondary schools over-subscribed.

6. **Pollution**: The large increase in the volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment which is already a cause for concern in several areas in the borough.

**Employment**: It is all very well suggesting that all these houses are to be built in East and West Horsley and Ockham but where are all the new inhabitants going to work? I do not believe that GBC has given proper and sustained thought to this. There are very few local jobs available and the lack of public transport means that most inhabitants will need to travel by car to and from work, this creating further congestion, noise and pollution.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/2061  **Respondent:** 8850689 / J Reardon Smith  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Infrastructure**: It would seem, to me anyway, that GBC has ignored the biggest single mass of objections to the plan and that is the lack of adequate infrastructure. Thousands upon thousands of residents have complained about this but it would appear that the amount of proposed development far exceeds any foreseeable provision of additional infrastructure. West and East Horsley, to put it bluntly, will be unable to cope with additional development because the scope for infrastructure improvement is so limited. The existing infrastructure is already fully stretched and struggling to cope with the current number of residents. In particular, the roads are of especial concern because there is absolutely no scope for additional roads or widening of roads meaning that existing problems will just be exacerbated if development is allowed to take place. Additional infrastructure concerns are lack of public transport, already limited parking at Horsley station, poor existing drainage, limited/stretched medical services and already over-subscribed local schools.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13399  **Respondent:** 8850817 / Sandra Woods  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object that infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels - ie roads, doctors, schools will be unable to cope.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16374  **Respondent:** 8850881 / N Reardon Smith  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object that infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels - ie roads, doctors, schools will be unable to cope.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Medical Facilities: The single medical practice in East/West Horsley is already heavily over-subscribed and it is very difficult to get an appointment.

1. Schools: The same comment applies to schooling in the area with both local primary and secondary schools over-subscribed.

1. Drainage/Flooding: Little has been mentioned of the impact that development would have on the drainage and sewerage systems which are already wholly inadequate. The roads near where I live (Ockham Road North and East Lane) regularly flood after heavy rain and the whole area is at serious risk of flooding. In particular, the site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is, in places, a level 3 flood risk area with local residents often having standing water in their gardens after rain. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem.

1. Pollution: The large increase in the volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment which is already a cause for concern in several areas in the borough.

9. Employment: It is all very well suggesting that all these houses are to be built in East and West Horsley and Ockham but where are all the new inhabitants going to work? I do not believe that GBC has given proper and sustained thought to this. There are very few local jobs available and the lack of public transport means that most inhabitants will need to travel by car to and from work, this creating further congestion, noise and pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13333  Respondent: 8850945 / Richard Bayes  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3

These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst I support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give me cause for concern.

I support EHPC comments that there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

I concur with East Horsley Parish Council (EHPC) who have made the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;

• The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;

• There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking;

• The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients. It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools. Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, would put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity I concur with EHPC that this needs to be done earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of

around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s. I support the EHPC position believes that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I object to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds.

I further object to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I oppose the plans to build so many more houses without providing the infrastructure required

- The current infrastructure is barely adequate for the existing number of residents, cars etc (e.g. Kingston Medical Centre in the Horsleys struggles to provide appointments when required, schools for East & West Horsley children are oversubscribed and there are no plans to build new schools or extend existing ones in the area, there are bottlenecks on some of the roads in the area such as the A3 and in East Horsley, it’s difficult to find a parking space in the village now to visit the local shops let alone when the population of the area has significantly increased. West Horsley has no Post Office and will lose its only general store in September. There is also a specific problem in the Horsleys in relation to flooding, with the last few years seeing regular instances of roads in the village flooded (e.g. East Lane / The Street, the main road through West Horsley has become impassable on a number of occasions; Ripley Lane in West Horsley regularly floods and the Ockham junction at the A3 remained inaccessible for over a week one recent Christmas due to floods. This will only get worse with more houses and the pressure this will bring.

- There are no plans for new infrastructure in the DLP to address these issues in the Horsleys.

- Clearly, existing infrastructure will be massively overstretched if the number of houses being proposed are built.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1532  Respondent: 8850977 / Sam Pinder  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I’m disappointed that the latest version of the local plan doesn’t address the issues around sustainability and infrastructure. Again, it is important that the Inspector visits the locations being considered for large developments as part of the local plan, to understand the impact of placing a development for hundreds or thousands of homes would have on the local area. In East and West Horsley, there are enormous pressures on local state primary and secondary schools, doctors’ surgeries and transport. This would get significantly worse if the number of houses proposed in the local plan for rural areas goes ahead.

I urge the inspector to reject the local plan, which shows a complete lack of understanding of the local area and would be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt in this area. There is a need for new homes in this area, but these need to be affordable and located in places where there is appropriate infrastructure to support the homes, not plonked in the middle of a rural village that only has 1,100 homes in the first place. There has been so much local opposition to these plans with so many letters and emails identifying flaws in the plans and their underlying methodology that it would be appalling if the local plan in is current state were approved. I trust an inspector would not be so foolish as to approve a plan just because he or she thinks that starting again from scratch would be worse – allowing an ill thought out and illegal plan to be adopted would be far worse and the wrong decision for an honest and independent person to make.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12856  Respondent: 8851233 / Helen Bayes  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICIES 11, 12 & 13

These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst I support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give me cause for concern.

I support EHPC comments that there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

I concur with East Horsley Parish Council (EHPC) who have made the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

• Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
• The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
• Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;
• The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
• There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking;
• The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients. It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools. Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, would put further strain on the existing infrastructure. Infrastructure issues are completely unresolved in the Local Plan.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity I concur with EHPC that this needs to be done earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s. I support the EHPC position believes that the failure to address the inadequacies of the
existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I object to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds.

I further object to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Policy 11, 12, 13 Infrastructure

With specific regard to East Horsley village and its immediate vicinity, the current infrastructure is already struggling to cope. There are insufficient school places, the demands on the medical centre is stretched, the drainage system is inadequate, and the narrow roads and lanes are dangerous due to level of traffic. Currently the roads through East Horsley are used as major rat runs from the A246 to/from the A3 and A24 and especially when there are delays on the M25. If the housing development as proposed for The Horsley proceed, this will add over 500 houses with no policy to address the current lack of infrastructure. The proposal to build 2000 homes on Wisley Aerodrome will, apart from the problems above, put additional demands on Horsley and Effingham railway stations. There is often already insufficient off street parking at Bishopsmead and Station Parades, which will be the closest retail outlets. I OBJECT ON THE GROUNDS THERE IS INADEQUATE CURRENT PROVISION AND FUTURE ABILITY TO MEET SUCH A DEMAND ON THE INFRA STRUCTURE

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7452  Respondent: 8854305 / A_P Latham  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In terms of infrastructure, the local schools are full. The medical facilities are already sorely stretched. Roads are overloaded with cars and heavy traffic. Drainage is inadequate. Car parks, both for retail use and at the railway station are overloaded every day with no scope for extending these key facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13855  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2841  Respondent: 8854977 / Susan Lukey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The roads are full to capacity and cant take any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The shortfall in local services.
I was unable to get my son into the Howard school due to a shortfall of places.
This despite having lived in the village for 25 years.
I wouldn't go through the pain process to try and get my younger son in in two years time.
So, a fairly basic problem there.
The ability to get in to the Doctor's surgery without using an emergency slot is challenging at best and often a lot worse than that.
The state of the local roads is just appalling as is the roadside maintenance clogging up footpaths.
And seriously you want to grow the population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Infrastructure already overloaded

Existing local roads are already unable to cope with existing traffic and are poorly maintained. They are too narrow with frequent potholes, sunken manhole covers and uneven, overgrown pavements (where indeed these even exist) making it dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians and often causing unnecessary damage to vehicles. Because they are narrow due to existing residential development there is little scope to improve the roads by widening. Junction 10 of the M25 at its intersection with the A3 has always been busy but since the opening of motorway services nearby it has been almost continuously congested.

Local schools are oversubscribed and crying out for relocation to larger sites (and their locations could then be redeveloped with residential property) - this does not appear to have been considered or addressed in these proposals. Local doctors and dentists likewise are stretched to full capacity and would be unable to cope with such an increase in local population.

The local train services are inadequate (as too are the parking facilities at local stations) and current bus services are laughable.

With our predominantly clay soil drainage is a problem and remedial work over recent years has done very little to solve the problems of sudden heavy rainfall and flash flooding.

The telephone system is antiquated and due to the incidence of private roads in the area, cable services are unlikely to be available any time soon so broadband service is generally poor.

Even without the proposed development at Ockham on the old airfield site, this level of proposed new development would place intolerable pressure on local roads, transport links and other infrastructure services.

Infrastructure already overloaded
Existing local roads are already unable to cope with existing traffic and are poorly maintained. They are too narrow with frequent potholes, sunken manhole covers and uneven, overgrown pavements (where indeed these even exist) making it dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians and often causing unnecessary damage to vehicles. Because they are narrow due to existing residential development there is little scope to improve the roads by widening. Junction 10 of the M25 at its intersection with the A3 has always been busy but since the opening of motorway services nearby it has been almost continuously congested.

Local schools are oversubscribed and crying out for relocation to larger sites (and their locations could then be redeveloped with residential property) - this does not appear to have been considered or addressed in these proposals. Local doctors and dentists likewise are stretched to full capacity and would be unable to cope with such an increase in local population.

The local train services are inadequate (as too are the parking facilities at local stations) and current bus services are laughable.

With our predominantly clay soil drainage is a problem and remedial work over recent years has done very little to solve the problems of sudden heavy rainfall and flash flooding.

The telephone system is antiquated and due to the incidence of private roads in the area, cable services are unlikely to be available any time soon so broadband service is generally poor.

Even without the proposed development at Ockham on the old airfield site, this level of proposed new development would place intolerable pressure on local roads, transport links and other infrastructure services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16935  Respondent: 8857185 / Tim Parker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The lack of detail regarding the additional infrastructure in terms of:

- schools
- roads - local and A3 (and A3 intersection)
- Tunnel proposal
- motorway - proximity to M25 and 2 lane section
- public transport
- parking

which ALL need to be considered fundamentally before any additional housing is approved & built.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17791  Respondent: 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT to this policy as it stands. Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The methodology commissioned by the Council to assess traffic and the corresponding roads infrastructure needs is inadequate for the purpose of the Local Plan and identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Under the growth proposed some locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. Even the A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsustainable development will take place by a more insidious process.

With regard to SANG provision, GBC has demonstrated that it has no genuine interest in conserving and enhancing biodiversity and clearly regards the Thames Basin Heaths SPA as an obstacle to be overcome rather than a valued asset. This is underlined at the end of the Policy wording which indicates that the council is more interested in meeting its legal responsibilities than actually protecting wildlife. GBC is failing to take account of existing biodiversity at sites selected for SANG provision.

Some infrastructure, as identified in Figure 1 of the draft IDP- is within the control and remit of Guildford Borough Council – they have some influence in relation to planning – but much is under the control, and is the fiscal responsibility of, Surrey County Council or Highways England.

It is not realistic to assume that car use can effectively be replaced for all or even many users. Those who are disabled or infirm cannot easily substitute car journeys with bike travel: the elderly; the disabled; those caring for young children (particularly uncertain bike users and those with multiple children to care for); those wishing to use cars for supermarket or other bulky shopping; those who wish to commute to work and have no facilities for showering or changing on arrival; those who have lengthy and tiring commutes at present, for which the car is the final (short) element of a long journey (for those commuting into London from outside Guildford, a daily 3 hour commute is typical; this cannot realistically be extended by extensive cycling). All these factors mean that the replacement of the car with cycle use is likely to be overstated by many studies, particularly given narrow roads which do not allow effective or safe bike lanes.

Funding is not the only - nor the main - obstacle to improving infrastructure within the borough, and this seems not to be recognized. Guildford is a gap town, set in a bowl within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the south of the borough, and with large sections of the borough affected by the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area to the north. There is a ribbon through the middle of the borough which contains rail and road links to London, but is already heavily congested, is Green Belt, AONB, SPA or more than one of the above. Very little of the borough is available for extensive development of infrastructure or any building. Do we really want solutions that involve driving new roads through our remaining countryside – including the AONB – at huge cost in financial and environmental terms. Such solutions may be the only ones left when the inadequacies of this proposed Local Plan are realised after the event.

Policy indicates note an intention to pool Community Infrastructure Levy from most new build development and to use CIL receipts to assist in provision of infrastructure needed to support the delivery of the plan. As with other aspects of planning, there is a failure to recognize that out of town settlements in particular have particularly high requirements for additional new basic infrastructure in order to exist at all – roads, sewers, water provision, electricity, gas, telephone and broadband links will all need to be provided and in many cases the links to existing services will need to be upgraded before these can be implemented. The ability to divert funds from CIL to other uses will be inherently limited, not least that otherwise the proposed settlements will not be able to function. The Council strategy of taking CIL from new build
In the Green Belt seems to be to pay for roads within the town centre, as indicated in the policy which notes that legislation prevents the use of planning obligations to fund existing infrastructure deficits.

In the reasoned justification, it is indicated that the council will be prepared to negotiate if an applicant claims that the infrastructure requirements for their development make it unviable. This means that some developments will go ahead anyway and worsen the infrastructure deficit. The Policy claims that infrastructure needed “should” be provided and available when first needed but we have no confidence in the council enforcing this.

The absolute constraint on developmental capacity within the borough represented by the infrastructure limitations cannot be swept aside, but the council has ignored this and failed to apply a constraint on the housing number.

We are not convinced that the extent of existing traffic congestion has been fully recognised by the SCC transport assessment because the methodology employed waters down the level of traffic observed. This has knock-on effects when modelling the various development scenarios. The result is that the requirements identified (expensive though they may seem) are the tip of the iceberg. One of the easiest issues to understand is the use of average peak hour flows for the baseline data. SCC acknowledge that that this is “typically lower” (see Transport Assessment 4.13.4 but GBC prefer the averaging approach with some eloquent wording in their Headline network metrics (3.9). A much better solution would have been to collect reliable baseline data that allowed for the effects of queuing and modelled each hour (or a shorter time period). Such an approach would have cost more but GBC seem unwilling to go the extra mile for reliable evidence while being content to spend large sums of money on propaganda exercises such as their one-sided video. There are other more technical reasons why the transport assessment methodology fails to fully identify current and planned congestion.

Planned developments for Guildford and Waverley Boroughs were modelled together but growth for the rest of the UK was allowed for only using the DoT forecasts. As a result it is not clear whether adequate allowance has been made for significant developments planned for Woking and other neighbouring Boroughs. This represents an inconsistency in approach with the West Surrey SHMA.

Many of the results for the PM peak are missing (TA 4.1.11 states that “these can be set out in an addendum report at a later date”). We believe that those who need to travel on the roads in peak hours will be every bit as interested in their future journeys home as they are for going to work. Publication of the Transport Assessment was delayed until the start of the consultation period so perhaps the non-inclusion of many PM results was simply a result of running out of time.

The Model Development Validation Report does include some interesting baseline data that may be of interest to residents in terms of local knowledge of traffic.

We are not convinced that it would be practical or desirable to end up in a position where the only solution to traffic congestion is to build many more new roads as by-passes through the Surrey countryside, or turn existing roads into dual carriageways, or demolish buildings (some of which may be historic) in order to accommodate higher capacity junctions in built-up areas.

It is noted that the infrastructure Development Plan was developed using hotspots identified in “OGSTAR” (the previous Transport Assessment used for the 2014 consultation) as a starting point. (See Transport Topic Paper (5.56)). However, the site list used for OGSTAR was not even compatible with the former draft Local Plan let alone the current one. Despite this, the Key Evidence mentions the June 2016 TA but not OGSTAR.

Appendix C (Infrastructure Schedule) is lacking in detail concerning what work will actually be carried out for most of the Local Road Network projects and the cost estimates are clearly at the guesswork stage suggesting that these schemes have not been fully thought through or checked for viability. If more detail is available then why not provide it.

It is not clear whether CIL will be received in time to put the required infrastructure in place for each development – or what penalties will be applied for late payment.

The Monitoring Indicators rely entirely on annual CIL receipts and spending. Surely they should look at actual infrastructure delivery and any changes in its adequacy.
The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen.

The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/2657  **Respondent:** 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

18 POLICY I1 INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY


18.2 I object to ASP 3 new A3/A3100/B2215/A247 Burpham-Burnt common all-movements junction, formed by a new connector road linking between new A3/A3100 Burpham junction (SRN4) and the B2215 London Road, in combination with the new A3 northbound on-slip (SRN9) and the new A3 southbound off-slip (SRN10) under Infrastructure and Delivery.

18.3 If development gets the go ahead for the strategic site at Gosden Hill it would be logical to construct a 4 way A3 interchange at Burpham. It is not feasible to pass the problem down the line to Send which will already be bearing the brunt of traffic generated from a planned 4,000 homes. The A247 link road to Woking already at capacity will become gridlocked.

18.4 I object to SRN4 New A3/A3100 Burpham junction with relocated A3 southbound off-slip and new A3 southbound on-slip. This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 whereby traffic will be passing directly through Send from the A3 and M25 and the proposed new development at Wisley.

18.5 I object to SRN9 A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common) and SRN10 A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common). This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 which is already at capacity.

18.6 I object TO THE PROPOSED LINK ROAD OFF THE A31 TO THE Research Park, Hospital and Tesco where increased traffic already exceeds allowed expansion permitted when Manor Farm development was approved in 2003. This will impinge on the AONB, historic views of the town and be harmful to wild life including protected and rare species.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2436  **Respondent:** 8858433 / Eric Peters  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Policy 11 - Infrastructure and Delivery

I object. The plan targets greenfield sites which requires heavy infrastructure. Most of the infrastructure is old and congested and cannot cope with the increased demands that will be placed upon it. The infrastructure improvements would need to come first and the plan needs to reflect this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8692   Respondent: 8858657 / Oliver Cass   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Local infrastructure

There are significant shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it stands today and the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in this Document will exacerbate this problem.

The local infrastructure is not set up to deal with significant population growth and additional housing. Current examples in East and West Horsley include:

1. Through roads already very busy at peak times, have multiple pot holes, and have pavements which are either very narrow, do not exist at all, or are in extremely poor condition. This makes the village unsuitable for high volumes of any kind of traffic, let alone the volume of HGVs now using it. As a mother of 3 young children using the pavements daily to walk to school, it is unfortunately only a matter of time before the deteriorating traffic, road and pavement combination will result in a serious incident.
2. Drainage system already very prone to overflows, eg, on Ockham Road North from the railway bridge to the junction with East Lane, every time there is heavy rain, resulting in the road becoming akin to a river. Road repairs last year have done absolutely nothing to alleviate the problem as the capacity of the drain under the road cannot cope with the volume of water following rainfall. The only solution, with the existing level of housing (and therefore surface run-off) is to completely overhaul the drainage system. If additional housing stock is constructed the already unacceptable surface run-off and flash flooding problem will become worse.
3. Schools already significantly over-subscribed with local children
4. Limited bus service.
5. Train service to London already very busy. Additional commuters would make it likely that not everyone getting on at Horsley station at peak time would get a seat, despite the journey being 50 mins into London Waterloo.

There are no proposals in respect of any of the existing problems with roads, pavements, drainage, transport and schools.

It is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley and in West Horsley and Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. The failure to address the serious inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a completely fundamental and very serious omission in GBC’s Document.

Furthermore, and as I also described in my comments about removing East Horsley from the Green Belt, East Horsley is an attractive village for people wishing to relocate from more built up areas, due its village feel. That includes the village school, The Raleigh. Our family, and many of our friends chose to move to Horsley precisely because of the primary school, which manages to retain a village feel, yet is of ample size to provide the facilities required for children from Reception – Year 6. The existing school would not be able to cater for an increase in demand, and unless we wish to remove the current attractiveness of this village school, nor should we consider an increase in the numbers.
I therefore object to the infrastructure proposals contained in GBC’s Document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10387  Respondent: 8858881 / Stephen Meredith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1) Many villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time with road surfaces are in a very poor condition. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around many villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village and neighbouring villages will become even more congested. Every week thousands of cyclists pass through these villages following the promotion of the area in the 2012 Olympic cycle road trials. The narrow rural roads do not have cycle lanes or even proper pedestrian footpaths. In West Clandon much of the length of The Street has a narrow footpath on only one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure, as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income instead of recognising this as a key constraint.

It is highly likely that developers faced with large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development unviable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I am concerned about the lack of planning for infrastructure requirements and whether the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the
existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate as utilities and services, such as the electrical network, sewers, Doctors’ Practice and Police, in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity. The lack of plans to improve these services should be a bar to development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1187  
Respondent: 8858881 / Stephen Meredith  
Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Soundness

There is insufficient detail to explain how the revised plan will deal with existing traffic pressures in North East Guildford and fails to address the cumulative effect on traffic flows on the A247 of new housing at Gosden Hill, Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch combined with greater commercial use at Burnt Common.

Surrey County Council's proposals for 100,000 visitors a year to Newland Corner makes the traffic problem worse in this part of the borough and has not been factored into transport requirements in the plan.

The narrow A247 through West Clandon will simply not be able to cope with the volumes of traffic that would result from being the only main road over the railway outside of central Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15256  
Respondent: 8858913 / Stephen Carter  
Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure and delivery policies 11. 12, 13. 14

Whilst I support the general principle of the policy statements as presented in each case there are currently serious deficiencies and shortcomings of the existing infrastructure in the GBC borough at the present time without the additional problems likely to be incurred with the excessive house building proposed in the Local Plan.

Most of the borough's infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate current needs and and organic growth. The Local Plan is targeting greenfield sites which require a lot of infrastructure investment as a pre-condition of sustainable development. It would be more appropriate to assess infrastructure needs and tailor development accordingly.

As the Local Plan does not address current existing infrastructure needs (such as poor road conditions, insufficient school places and medical centre capacities), it is not possible to support additional infrastructure proposals for the proposed new developments. Therefore I OBJECT to these policies.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The addition of additional facilities such as schools, doctor's surgery and shops on Wisley Airfield would not take the burden off Ripley as they would be for the Inhabitants of the new village. These new inhabitants who would still use Ripley as a route to avoid the traffic jams on the A3.

I also like the idea of being able to walk from my home in Elm Corner to shops, a surgery and a pub on the Airfield. However without major investment (like another lane on each side of the M25 from Reigate to Woking) in the road way infrastructure the plan does not work as the area would become one large traffic jam similar to that experienced by the Weybridge inhabitants who have suffered for years from overdevelopment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to this policy as it stands. Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The methodology commissioned by the Council to assess traffic and the corresponding roads infrastructure needs is inadequate for the purpose of the Local Plan and identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Under the growth proposed some locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. Even the A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

With regard to SANG provision, GBC has demonstrated that it has no genuine interest in conserving and enhancing biodiversity and clearly regards the Thames Basin Heaths SPA as an obstacle to be overcome rather than a valued asset. This is underlined at the end of the Policy wording which indicates that the council is more interested in meeting its legal responsibilities than actually protecting wildlife. GBC is failing to take account of existing biodiversity at sites selected for SANG provision.
Some infrastructure, as identified in Figure 1 of the draft IDP- is within the control and remit of Guildford Borough Council – they have some influence in relation to planning – but much is under the control, and is the fiscal responsibility of, Surrey County Council or Highways England.

It is not realistic to assume that car use can effectively be replaced for all or even many users. Those who are disabled or infirm cannot easily substitute car journeys with bike travel: the elderly; the disabled; those caring for young children (particularly uncertain bike users and those with multiple children to care for); those wishing to use cars for supermarket or other bulky shopping; those who wish to commute to work and have no facilities for showering or changing on arrival; those who have lengthy and tiring commutes at present, for which the car is the final (short) element of a long journey (for those commuting into London from outside Guildford, a daily 3 hour commute is typical; this cannot realistically be extended by extensive cycling). All these factors mean that the replacement of the car with cycle use is likely to be overstated by many studies, particularly given narrow roads which do not allow effective or safe bike lanes.

Funding is not the only - nor the main - obstacle to improving infrastructure within the borough, and this seems not to be recognized. Guildford is a gap town, set in a bowl within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the south of the borough, and with large sections of the borough affected by the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area to the north. There is a ribbon through the middle of the borough which contains rail and road links to London, but is already heavily congested, is Green Belt, AONB, SPA or more than one of the above. Very little of the borough is available for extensive development of infrastructure or any building. Do we really want solutions that involve driving new roads through our remaining countryside – including the AONB – at huge cost in financial and environmental terms. Such solutions may be the only ones left when the inadequacies of this proposed Local Plan are realised after the event.

Policy indicates note an intention to pool Community Infrastructure Levy from most new build development and to use CIL receipts to assist in provision of infrastructure needed to support the delivery of the plan. As with other aspects of planning, there is a failure to recognize that out of town settlements in particular have particularly high requirements for additional new basic infrastructure in order to exist at all – roads, sewers, water provision, electricity, gas, telephone and broadband links will all need to be provided and in many cases the links to existing services will need to be upgraded before these can be implemented. The ability to divert funds from CIL to other uses will be inherently limited, not least that otherwise the proposed settlements will not be able to function. The Council strategy of taking CIL from new build in the Green Belt seems to be to pay for roads within the town centre, as indicated in the policy which notes that legislation prevents the use of planning obligations to fund existing infrastructure deficits.

In the reasoned justification, it is indicated that the council will be prepared to negotiate if an applicant claims that the infrastructure requirements for their development make it unviable. This means that some developments will go ahead anyway and worsen the infrastructure deficit. The Policy claims that infrastructure needed “should” be provided and available when first needed but I have no confidence in the council enforcing this.

The absolute constraint on developmental capacity within the borough represented by the infrastructure limitations cannot be swept aside, but the council has ignored this and failed to apply a constraint on the housing number.

I am not convinced that the extent of existing traffic congestion has been fully recognised by the SCC transport assessment because the methodology employed waters down the level of traffic observed. This has knock-on effects when modelling the various development scenarios. The result is that the requirements identified (expensive though they may seem) are the tip of the iceberg. One of the easiest issues to understand is the use of average peak hour flows for the baseline data. SCC acknowledge that that this is “typically lower” (see Transport Assessment 4.13.4 but GBC prefer the averaging approach with some eloquent wording in their Headline network metrics (3.9). A much better solution would have been to collect reliable baseline data that allowed for the effects of queuing and modelled each hour (or a shorter time period). Such an approach would have cost more but GBC seem unwilling to go the extra mile for reliable evidence while being content to spend large sums of money on propaganda exercises such as their one-sided video. There are other more technical reasons why the transport assessment methodology fails to fully identify current and planned congestion.

Planned developments for Guildford and Waverley Boroughs were modelled together but growth for the rest of the UK was allowed for only using the DoT forecasts. As a result it is not clear whether adequate allowance has been made for significant developments planned for Woking and other neighbouring Boroughs. This represents an inconsistency in approach with the West Surrey SHMA.
Many of the results for the PM peak are missing (TA 4.1.11 states that “these can be set out in an addendum report at a later date”). We believe that those who need to travel on the roads in peak hours will be every bit as interested in their future journeys home as they are for going to work. Publication of the Transport Assessment was delayed until the start of the consultation period so perhaps the non-inclusion of many PM results was simply a result of running out of time.

The Model Development Validation Report does include some interesting baseline data that may be of interest to residents in terms of local knowledge of traffic.

We are not convinced that it would be practical or desirable to end up in a position where the only solution to traffic congestion is to build many more new roads as by-passes through the Surrey countryside, or turn existing roads into dual carriageways, or demolish buildings (some of which may be historic) in order to accommodate higher capacity junctions in built-up areas.

It is noted that the infrastructure Development Plan was developed using hotspots identified in “OGSTAR” (the previous Transport Assessment used for the 2014 consultation) as a starting point. (See Transport Topic Paper (5.56)). However, the site list used for OGSTAR was not even compatible with the former draft Local Plan let alone the current one. Despite this, the Key Evidence mentions the June 2016 TA but not OGSTAR.

Appendix C (Infrastructure Schedule) is lacking in detail concerning what work will actually be carried out for most of the Local Road Network projects and the cost estimates are clearly at the guesswork stage suggesting that these schemes have not been fully thought through or checked for viability. If more detail is available then why not provide it.

It is not clear whether CIL will be received in time to put the required infrastructure in place for each development – or what penalties will be applied for late payment.

The Monitoring Indicators rely entirely on annual CIL receipts and spending. Surely they should look at actual infrastructure delivery and any changes in its adequacy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: psp171/1130  Respondent:  8860897 / Julia Shaw  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

2. I object to ASP 3 new A3/A3100/B2215/A247 Burpham-Burnt common all-movements junction, formed by a new connector road linking between new A3/A3100 Burpham junction (SRN4) and the B2215 London Road, in combination with the new A3 northbound on-slip (SRN9) and the new A3 southbound off-slip (SRN10) under Infrastructure and Delivery.
3. If development gets the go ahead for the strategic site at Gosden Hill it would be logical to construct a 4 way A3 interchange at Burpham. It is not feasible to pass the problem down the line to Send which will already be bearing the brunt of traffic generated from a planned 4,000 homes. The A247 link road to Woking already at capacity will become gridlocked.
4. I object to SRN4 New A3/A3100 Burpham junction with relocated A3 southbound off-slip and new A3 southbound on-slip. This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 whereby traffic will be passing directly through Send from the A3 and M25 and the proposed new development at Wisley.
5. I object to SRN9 A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common) and SRN10 A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common). This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 which is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The village currently has no further capacity for families who need either school or GP/medical facilities, so more housing development cannot be sustained without additional investment in such infrastructure. Is GBC prepared to make significant finance available for additional facilities?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9744  Respondent: 8864161 / Phyllis Kirkland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

How do you plan for all these new places to have people who can live in the villages? We do not have enough doctors, road space, school area, parking, shops and a dozen other things for that many people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10567  Respondent: 8864161 / Phyllis Kirkland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We would be totally overloaded if you built so many houses in this area. Local schools are already filled, the medical services over busy, the roads not big enough for all that extra traffic, not sufficient car parks and drainage is inadequate. This is a village and we do not have the facility to improve on all these things to allow you to do it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/542  Respondent: 8865281 / R G Dedman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
This proposed development of 400 houses plus some industrial use, would put a strain to far, on our Medical Centre, Schools etc.

The slip roads proposed onto the A3 would be ineffective because the A3 is already blocked to a crawl, in the rush hour, both North and South bound.

Please leave this area of Green Belt Alone.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

I object, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past
through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule.

Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17624   Respondent: 8865697 / Robert Treble   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A37, Bell & Colevill, A38 Manor Farm, A40 Waterloo Farm and A4, East Lane;

Collectively these site add a disparate number of dwellings to the rural village of West Horsley where the remaining general store is scheduled to close, autumn 2016. Based on the current households of 1121, the potential development of 385 dwellings gives rise to a significant increase of 35%. The resulting population will be dependent upon the remaining local facilities in East Horsley together with their additional 188 households.

That is to say; SCHOOLS - today we do not have sufficient school places to meet local needs. Children often have to be given places away from their otherwise local classmates. MEDICAL FACILITIES - today the medical services are struggling to cope with demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/1693   Respondent: 8865697 / Robert Treble   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the policy on Infrastructure and delivery.

Comments regarding the current overloading of all aspects of infrastructure were made during previous consultations. There is no reason to believe that there will be any improvement in delivery of infrastructure capability in the future and it is obvious that the only additional infrastructure being considered is that required for new development. That means that the current infrastructure deficit will continue throughout the plan period. It also means that current underperformance will be accentuated by the addition of new developments and, particularly for road transport aspects of infrastructure, the disruption resulting from development works will exacerbate the current situation.

The sustainability of development in West Horsley is particularly questionable and the evidence of this is apparent from its position in the settlement hierarchy table produced by GBC (A.XII).

In conclusion, I object to the way in which the distribution of proposed new housing across the borough has changed from 2016 to 2017 as it increases the pressure on the Metropolitan Green Belt in the area of the borough which is most sensitive to loss.

For the Guildford area and for Ash and Tongham the proportion of homes is roughly the same from 2016 to 2017. Housing allocation for the Western rural area of the borough has reduced by 25% and the Eastern area has increased by
14%. Thus, of the total house allocation for the borough during the plan period, 48% is planned to be built in the Eastern rural areas. This inevitably means that additional Green Belt land will be utilised and the indication is that around 58% of all the new development in the borough will be built on Green Belt land. This does not accord with statements that the Green Belt will be protected, nor that a "brown field first" policy will be implemented.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14848  **Respondent:** 8865985 / Grant Ringshaw  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. I have personally witnessed HGVs mounting the pavements on many occasions because they are unable to pass oncoming traffic any other way on this narrow road. Only last week one HGV only narrowly missed one of our neighbours who was walking with her children on the way to school.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1355  Respondent: 8875233 / Richard Hiam  Agent: 8875233

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? **( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I **OBJECT**, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I **OBJECT** to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/14002 | Respondent: 8875265 / Wendy and Peter Donaldson | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 |
I am writing to object strongly to Guildford’s local plan for West Horsley and and planning for the surrounding areas which also affects West Horsley.

Reasons for objection:

The lack of infrastructure that already exists. We only have one infant and junior school, one medical practice and a few local shops. The school is already full to capacity. The Local Plan does not consider or propose expanding any of these services. Other resources will also be swamped.

The roads are already busy and the country roads are poorly maintained. There are few parking facilities. At weekends the roads are crowded with cyclists who delay traffic and cause endless frustration to drivers. The impact of the additional traffic caused by the proposed developments for West and East Horsley and other villages will increase the chaos and danger on the roads. Already the traffic has increased through West Horsley Village. Larger vehicles are starting to use the road, particularly when the M25 is blocked (quite a frequent occurrence). The A3 already carries too much traffic causing endless delays around the Guildford area for most of the day. The M25 is stop/start traffic or traffic is at a complete standstill, again for a lot of the day. This must already be polluting our environment.

If public transport was increased this would impact on severely on the current traffic situation.

Our local roads, particularly Ripley Lane are subject to flooding when there is heavy rain. Thames Water has already advised Guildford Borough Council that the wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand from all of the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be
an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will
result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and
risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the
road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns
over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required,
if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been
identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing
residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and
sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages
Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon
existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will
stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Finally I would like to comment on the sites in East and West Horsley where I live. My comments above on Policies in the Plan will make clear that I think it unreasonable and grossly bad planning to propose a 35% increase in the number of homes in West Horsley. Certainly the Horsleys need some new affordable homes but they do not need 533 new homes, a vast number of which will be large houses for commuters. There are inadequate bus services and the trains are already full. (it is impossible to park at Horsley or Effingham stations some days) The medical services are at full stretch and the Raleigh Primary School and Howard of Effingham Secondary School are already turning pupils away. Both villages already suffer from flooding and the addition of 533 new homes will exacerbate the problem.

Of the six major sites proposed, the Manor Farm site (RefA 38) and the Ockham Road North site (RefA 39) are perhaps the least objectionable since the Manor Farm site is fairly self-contained and presents little scope for further expansion while the Ockham Road site is close to the shops, medical centre and station, so offering the possibility of reduced car use and a suitable sit for smaller homes for people wishing to downsize (always assuming the drainage problems on that site could be overcome). The East Lane site (A41) is the most objectionable since it would destroy an open area of countryside and potentially lead to much further development.

West Horsley is a rural village. It is not semi urban and it would be madness to develop a semi urban village five miles from Guildford with no viable proposals regarding infrastructure.

Guildford does not really need 13,860 new homes. The Plan should be put on hold and reviewed post-Brexit with a view to determining a reduced target based on updated assumptions that can be disclosed and debated. We could then hopefully identify a sensible number of homes to be developed in the villages without destroying the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
temporary school room 'containers' to accommodate current numbers. The additional strain on the system which will arise has not be addressed by Surrey CC nor does GBC seem to have allowed suitable land area for addition of schools and playgrounds.

I therefore object to the proposed numbers of houses GBC are planning.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• So in essence, with regard to the villages of East Horsley and West Horsley, the Guildford Local Plan imposes an unsupportable burden on drainage infrastructure, schools, the roads network, medical services, shopping provision, parking facilities and public transport. Therefore, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the Guildford Local Plan, as currently drafted, on the basis that allowances for these issues are barely addressed and there is no consideration whatsoever for the need to expand local utilities and services to accommodate the proposed increase of residents in East and West Horsley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/404  Respondent: 8879841 / Jonathan and Theresa Hulford-Funnel  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plan due to the impact upon local schools and our medical facilities.

Our local schools in the area are already full and oversubscribed. There doesn’t appear to be any extra school places planned to accommodate the extra children that would move into these new houses.

It is a similar situation in our medical centre. Unless you are extremely unwell and in need of immediate medical attention, it is currently almost impossible to get a timely appointment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14983  Respondent: 8880321 / Elizabeth Baker  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The consultation does not deal adequately with infrastructure demands, solutions to which are needed in advance of, not following, development. Anyone who has travelled along the A3 in the morning and afternoon rush hours will know how inadequate that road now is around Guildford. The A246 is similarly congested, especially at school times, and the additional housing in areas that use this as an artery will make short journeys intolerably slow. Trains between London and Guildford and the intermediate stations are overcrowded, parking at stations is inadequate and expensive.

Potential Sites for Development
Sitese in East and West Horsley:
Schools
There are 3 primary age schools in the Horsleys already (two independent and one state), these cause considerable traffic problems and a further increase in school population cannot be supported. The local primary school (The Raleigh School) serves East and West Horsley and is oversubscribed - even children living in the Horsleys cannot all obtain a place. It’s location creates long tailbacks because it is accessed from 2 roads both of which are cul-de-sacs. At secondary age the Howard of Effingham School is oversubscribed and the Horsleys are not in the catchment area for the George Abbott School in Merrow. The council has recently refused an application to rebuild the Howard of Effingham at a nearby site so there is little prospect of expanding the school without further compromising the facilities provided. The Surrey County Council is very aware of the problems there have been in allocating Horsley children to places for secondary education. Even halving the proposed development of over 500 additional homes in East and West Horsley will result in hundreds of
additional school-aged children in need of a school place. This is simply unrealistic and unsustainable.

Road and Rail Transport
The two roads through the Horsleys are narrow and in many places are without pavements but are appropriate for the size and nature of the villages as they currently are. Both roads are crossed by low narrow railway bridges and both suffer from other pinch points. As the majority of additional residents would have to commute to work either by driving through the villages to the A3 or A246 or to get to the station, a significant increase in population would exacerbate transport problems. Already access to, and progress along, the A3 and A246 is very slow especially during school term times. The consultation document identifies A3/M25 access problems in relation to development of Wisley airfield and the same would apply to further development in East and West Horsley.

Whilst there is reasonable rail transport to London or Guildford and a less efficient service to Leatherhead and Epsom, due to rail congestion the service between Horsley and London now takes longer than it did in the 1920s. Even with more home–working than was the case some years ago, at peak times it is necessary to stand for much of the journey from London and when there is disruption, passengers may not even be able to board the train due to overcrowding. Although Southwest trains is extending capacity this will quickly be overwhelmed. The 500 homes could create an equal number of additional passengers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15583  Respondent: 8880321 / Elizabeth Baker  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object.
There will be significantly increased congestion to local village roads resulting from proposed development and there is no plan for road infrastructure

Over 5000 new homes are proposed between the M25 and Burpham. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will result in substantially increased congestion with no plans to remedy this. Roads are narrow and mostly without footpaths. 5000 more houses in this area, coupled with pollution from the correspondingly busier A3 and M25, will have a profound impact upon declining air quality.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2277  Respondent: 8880321 / Elizabeth Baker  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Local Facilities and Infrastructure

The consultation is flawed as it does not set out for comment the infrastructure changes that would be needed at the time of building new homes to support the nature and extent of development proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4000</th>
<th>Respondent: 8880353 / Judith Allen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the threat the Local Plan poses to transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking, the development is too isolated and, even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result I an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the local roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads on Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HVG movements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The danger this traffic will causes to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the ab ensue of any cycle paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14930</th>
<th>Respondent: 8880865 / Jane Paton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A local plan which proposes to increase the stock of houses in the borough by 13,860-an increase of over twenty percent. is irresponsible. Local road, health and education infrastructure is already over-stretched. Adding this quantity of new housing will have negative effects on the living standards of all who live in the borough. There is no convincing evidence that new infrastructure to accommodate even the needs of current residents will be forthcoming- let alone the massive investments required to accommodate the largest housebuilding programme in the history of the borough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPP16/3590  Respondent: 8880929 / Maurice Dawes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that the infrastructure requirements have not been fully considered and are likely to prove inadequate for the proposed housing levels affecting roads, doctors and schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7160  Respondent: 8881345 / Lynne Ground  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7161  Respondent: 8881345 / Lynne Ground  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11584  Respondent: 8881537 / Jean Baptist  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3553</th>
<th>Respondent: 8881825 / Siobhan Collins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to development without improvements to local infrastructure

Local facilities eg doctors, schools, transport facilities in Horsley are already stretched. Any development planned must take account of required improvements to local infrastructure. The number of homes currently planned for West and East Horsley is entirely unsustainable.

I would like to end by saying I appreciate it would be naïve and unrealistic to expect the villages of our borough to stay exactly the same. I would support limited new development in West and East Horsley, WITHIN the existing village boundaries and on existing developed sites like the Ramada Thatcher’s Hotel (Ref A36, ID 2044) and the Bell and Colvill Garage (Ref A37, ID 16) as long as the local infrastructure is improved to cope.

I would NEVER support the building of homes on the Green Belt and I object to the village boundaries being extended to increase the availability of land for housing. However, I would support the building of a new Raleigh School in East Lane (Ref A41, ID 2063) as I believe this need to be exceptional (the current site is not sustainable for the existing population of the village) and there is no other local site previously developed which would be large enough or suitable for a new school.

In conclusion, I urge the council to revise the local housing needs and amend the Local Plan so that development of Brownfield sites is undertaken and the Green Belt protected for future generations.

I copy in my local councillors here who were elected on their promises of protecting the Green Belt and supporting their local communities. I hope they do so.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6801</th>
<th>Respondent: 8882305 / Jill Ryan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no infrastructure to support large housing developments - limited shops, medical facilities and schools, the proposal would bring several thousand more people to the area with attendant cars - the Guildford area road systems and major transport links such as the A3 and M25 are already full to capacity during the day and there is very limited public transport. Train services and parking at the local station is at capacity and the proposed development sites would in any case involve car use to get to the station.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7297  **Respondent:** 8882881 / Andy and Sandy Homewood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

DRAINS, WATER SUPPLY, FLOOD RISK, CONGESTION

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes will lead to flood risk here and downstream (leading towards Ripley and further afield towards and along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6556  **Respondent:** 8883105 / P J Warner  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

To propose fairly extensive building and an increase in the local population without considering the infrastructure is a gross error of planning. The schools are full and there is, apparently, no money for school building. The station car parks are full. there is no obvious room to expand shopping facilities or parking areas to shops. The doctors' surgery is at capacity also the roads are frequently clogged up. If anything, expansion of the infrastructure is almost a greater problem than expanding housing provision. Hence, I object most strongly to the new local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3329  **Respondent:** 8883489 / N & B Hinchliff  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2. The congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5750   Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

   Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

   Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

   I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

   Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

   With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

   The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

   The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5753   Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16621  Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16623  Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3747  Respondent: 8885217 / Rupert and Claire Jackson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3  General comments

Medical facilities. The current medical centre in Kingston Avenue, East Horsley is always extremely busy and it is difficult to make appointments. If the population increases there will be a shortage of GPs, which is already a national problem. An increase in the size of the medical centre will put corresponding pressure on local hospitals particularly the Royal Surrey County Hospital in Guildford.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1194  **Respondent:** 8886497 / Quentin Bradshaw  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The roads, schools, drainage, trains and internet simply cannot cope with this planned level of increased population. Whoever is suggesting these new houses clearly does not live here, drive on our local roads, nor try to commute by train.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1301  **Respondent:** 8886913 / Rosamund Bovill  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Infrastructure We understand that some infrastructure plans outlined in the last Guildford Plan have still not been implemented. This does not give us much confidence that the 2016 Plan will be able to achieve its goals for schools, roads, drains, surgeries etc. No Plans have yet been published to reassure residents that these have been considered and funds are available.

1. Transport. The transport to support more housing is not sufficient. The roads are not suitable for more buses. The Station Car Parks are full and there are no safe cycle paths. Many roads do not have pavements for pedestrian access to public transport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14188  **Respondent:** 8887009 / Jacqueline Weller  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**POLICIES I1, I2 & I3**

These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst we support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give us cause for concern.
I OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals and believe that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments. There are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

The following comments can be specifically made about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients. It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools.

Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13588</th>
<th>Respondent: 8887265 / Harvey Weller</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICIES I1, I2 &amp; I3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These three policies cover Infrastructure &amp; Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst we support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give us cause for concern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals and believe that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments. There are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.
The following comments can be specifically made about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients. It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3906  Respondent: 8887745 / Jan Wollard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Schools and Medical facilities.

As you must know, our schools are full and our Medical Centre stretched. You are making no promises that new schools are to be built, so I am assuming children living in all these new houses will have to travel out of the area to attend other schools. Not ideal in any way, and that means more traffic on the roads, and speeding through the village on our narrow roads, already a problem.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3907  Respondent: 8887745 / Jan Wollard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I understand that mention has been made of land at the tennis and cricket club at the top of Pennymead Drive. Are we not to have any recreational areas. Similarly the land at Kingston Meadow, which is enjoyed by everyone for sport, walking with dogs and for the village to come together to celebrate special occasions such as Jubilees and the Queen’s Birthday. I am completely lost for words that GBC can consider building so many houses in a lovely area and spoil it for everyone.
At one time it was considered safe to be within a Green Belt area, so why are you allowed to now relax those rules. I understand that people need housing, and I have no objection to houses being built in small pockets around the village eg. The Telephone Exchange Land, and I understand the need maybe for housing on Wisley Airfield, BUT ONLY PROVIDED the aforementioned facilities are put in place, SCHOOLS, DOCTORS SURGERY, POST OFFICE, SHOPS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.

Please please, give more consideration before you ruin a very lovely part of our country and turn us into a suburban community instead of a rural one.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4781</th>
<th>Respondent: 8888289 / Hazel Jones</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Local Plan makes no mention of infrastructure which is of immense importance to all residents. ROADS are narrow and dangerously congested (the railway bridge has recently been damaged by a huge transporter) and cyclist are numerous.

STREET LIGHTING is minimal.

PAVEMENTS in many areas are narrow or non-existent.

PARKING is a huge problem.

THE MEDICAL PRACTICE is overloaded.

LOCAL SCHOOLS are over subscribed.

DRAINAGE is inadequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2930</th>
<th>Respondent: 8888449 / Phillip Marazzi</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local facilities are totally inadequate for the kind of expansion that is suggested.

The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already working to maximum capacity. It has proved extremely difficult to recruit doctors to the area in the last couple of years. We are currently functioning thanks to the use of locum doctors, and this situation is likely to get worse. The building is also at maximum capacity and will struggle to cope with the massive increase in patient numbers. This increased population is
The roads are already struggling to cope with traffic, with inadequate parking in the villages. This development will massively increase the number of vehicles using the villages and roads. The quality of our roads is shameful, several of them resembling dirt tracks with current traffic, never mind the proposed increases.

Schools are full, and the presence of private schools in the area should not be included in the provision of education as they are not likely to contribute enough capacity. A possible economic downturn may lead to significant increased demand for state school places in the next few years as private education becomes less affordable for many families.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17578  Respondent: 8889761 / A Dougherty  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. I OBJECT to the total inadequate infrastructure being proposed around Clandon, Ripley & Send which will not be able to cope with any large housing increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17582  Respondent: 8889761 / A Dougherty  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

14. I OBJECT to GBCs unproportionate housing sites being mainly to the North of Guildford between Guildford and the M25 which will only create high pollution levels and a disproportionate quantity of traffic without any means of creating adequate highway infrastructure

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3664  Respondent: 8890465 / Saskia Horst  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would strongly like to object to the Guildford Local Plan to build 500 new houses around the Horsleys.
The infrastructure of our villages cannot cope with many more residents. The schools are full, the Doctor's surgery is almost impossible to get an appointment with.

The trains into London are to full capacity as is the parking facility at the train station.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPP16/4220</td>
<td>8890657 / David Weight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The Plan fails to address the need for a corresponding development of amenities and services in the planned building. Apart from constraints mentioned in No.4 (above) the wastewater network is not able to support the additional development (Thames Water advice to Guildford Borough); Flooding is also becoming a problem in the village, and further development of open land will exacerbate this issue which will lead to higher costs for the Borough Council; the local state school (Rayleigh School) is already over-subscribed with no room for expansion; Secondary education is equally constrained in the local catchment area and private schools in the area are at or near to full capacity. To my knowledge Surrey County Council has no plan to create further school places.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPP16/6231</td>
<td>8890689 / Christopher Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Infrastructure – I drive almost daily sometimes a few times a day down the road that leads from The Duke of Wellington Pub to Horsley station

The road is narrow at the best of times extremely narrow in places so much so that even 2 big cars may have difficulty passing through let alone lorries.

The road system is also crowded and was not built to sustain the number of dwellings currently existing let alone more.

East Horsley if the plans went through would be a magnet from the new developments around for shops/station/doctor etc and none of these are built to sustain the current level of population let alone an increase. On top of this the school system is also overstretched at the moment to add extra children would break it

The Gas/Electric/Water/Drains system I understand are already at or close to breaking point and would have to try and operate on an unsustainable level.

The appears to have been no real consideration given to the local infrastructure to build extra Schools/Doctors/Hospitals etc this is all totally unacceptable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
1. Schools

Local schools are already full and turning away children who apply. Where will you build more schools in the area? Where will you find the land for these schools, their playing fields and their parking? More impact on our rural environment....

1. Medical Facilities

It is already difficult to get an appointment with our doctor within about 10 days. The medical practice in Horsley would have to be enlarged, which would necessarily also involve enlarging or renewing the building and providing extra parking areas, encroaching on the adjacent recreation area.

On a more personal note, our property is in The Street adjacent to the Bell & Colville site where, according to your plan, 40 new homes are proposed. This is a Conservation Area. Are you proposing to abolish the Conversation Area? How would you provide access to The Street and/or the busy A246 Leatherhead/Guildford road? How would this access impact on the children attending the adjacent Cranmore School?

We strongly object to these proposals, and ask you to think again.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

3) Aspects of your current infrastructure are undeniably poor. As an example the footpath from the Forest Road junction to the village is perilous particularly for elderly and disabled people. I challenge any of your members to use a walking frame along this stretch without putting your life in your hands.

Your future ideas of supporting infrastructure are unclear. Apparently you intend to build an infrastructure at Wisley on an adhoc basis i.e. a school, class by class. In the meantime the burden of the necessary facilities will fall on Horsley to maintain.

Shopping facilities are very limited in the Horsleys. A huge increase in traffic is likely for East Horsley where parking is already a problem at the local shops and railway station.

Extremely limited public transport in the area suggests a further 2000 cars in the Horsley area. There is inadequate parking for the present proposals and no clear evidence of new car parking facilities in the plan.

The local state schools are oversubscribed and Doctor's appointments difficult to access.
In conclusion we consider the Local Plan as currently envisioned would seriously overburden the Horsley area infrastructure, infringe seriously the Green Belt. Indeed the need for such a disproportionate increase in housing is not proven.

Please substantially reduce the extent of the GBC proposals and carefully reconsider these plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

All of our local Schools are already full, our Medical facilities are already overstretched and our village Parking facilities (including the railway station and local shops) are already inadequate with no space for improvement. All local roads are narrow and were built at a time when the stage coach / pony & trap were the typical mode of transport rather than today’s 4x4’s, long-wheel courier vans and supermarket delivery vehicles. Much of the Horsleys are built on clay with the consequence that drainage is inadequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, a large number of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition, and have not been tendered. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested, with traffic accidents more likely to happen. I mention this as Surrey has become a mecca for cycling, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists passing through Ripley, Send and Clandon on the way to the Surrey Hills. Trade to local businesses such as the coffee shops in Ripley have benefitted from this pursuit, along with employment and wealth creation from local Small to Medium Enterprises (SME’s). I am like many a keen cyclist, and I am concerned that
the Surrey Hills will be damaged beyond recognition should this development be brought forward, thus losing it’s brand value, attraction and status. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road traffic accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. This comes at a time when many of the local schools are trying to encourage cycling within their School’s Travel Plans (STP’s).

Most of the local rural roads also do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. To example, in Clandon, where footpaths do exist, they are often very narrow in places with construction lorries mounting pavements in order to pass, and this has been already well documented by West Clandon Parish Council.

2. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, I share the view that my family and I along with all other existing residents’ in the locality will see our quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site. The farm land around the South bound extension, floods regularly. Should this development go ahead, I expect that the flood waters will be pushed closer to my property and will present greater risk for flooding.

I also note that without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and very likely to be overwhelmed. It is well documented that many local services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I am also concerned with the general reduction in future Police funding (Surrey Police identified that it needed to save £28.4m over the four years of the spending review between March 2011 and March 2015). Savings have been made, but their scope with new developments will increase, creating extra pressure. This will have further impact to all local residents as local Police will have 13,860 new homes during the plan period.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9301  Respondent: 8892737 / David Eagle  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

**I OBJECT** to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/3067</th>
<th>Respondent: 8892737 / David Eagle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Policies ID1 & ID2 Infrastructure – My Objections

Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits …”we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

B. Policies having an impact on the A247 – My Objections

The following objections are made because of the impact they will have on the A247 and hence the village of West Clandon.

B.i. Policy A25 – My Objections
Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

South bound off- and on-slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off-slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

B.ii. Policy A43 – My Objections

5) Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

B.iii. Policy A43a – My Objections

6) Provision of a Northbound on-slip road and a Southbound off-slip road to the A3 to join the A247. These are stated to be required to relieve Ripley from the effects of the development of Wisley. It is not clear how this could work unless traffic from Wisley wishing to go South either goes up to the A3/M25 roundabout and comes back down the A3 or direct access to the A3 (as claimed by the promoters of the Wisley development) Southbound is provided at Wisley/Ockham. In either case, slip roads at the A247 seem unnecessary. It is more likely that these slip roads are to provide access to the Garlick’s Arch and Burnt Common developments. The slip roads will have the effect of creating an all-ways junction with the A3 at Burnt Common making it a centre for future development and a traffic magnet with clear implications for the A247.

7) Burnt Common strategic industrial employment site for light industry, storage and distribution activities. It is to be designated an Industrial Strategic Employment Site which means that it is a preferred site for industrial development including waste management facilities. The site is 9ha which it is stated allows for considerable future expansion. This will generate large amounts of traffic including heavy vehicles on the A247.

B.iv. Policy A58 – My Objections

8) Slyfield development of 1000+ houses. (A road from Slyfield to Clay Lane and thus to the A3 has already been agreed.) This will generate traffic on the A247 from those wishing to go due South.

B.v. Policy A24 – My Objections

9) Slyfield development of 1000+ houses. (A road from Slyfield to Clay Lane and thus to the A3 has already been agreed.) This will generate traffic on the A247 from those wishing to go due South.

B.vi. Policy A35 – My Objections

10) The Wisley development of a new village / town with at least 2000 houses, 4-entry form secondary school and employment land. The development does not seem to meet the NPPF requirement that developments that generate significant movement will be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. The provision of slip roads at the A3/A247 junction to relieve the impact of this development on Ripley will have potentially severe effects on the A247.

B.vii. Policies A37, 38, 40, 42, 44 & 45 – My Objections

11) Some 295 houses in various smaller developments in West Horsley, 100 in Send and 15 in Ripley. These will generate traffic on the A247 to access the A3.

B.viii. Policy P2 Introduction – My Objections
The removal of green belt protection from the prison site meaning that it is likely to come forward for housing development. The nearest feasible access to the A3 is at the A247 junction.

B.ix. Non-plan Items– My Objections

Surrey County Council’s business plan for Newlands Corner (not referenced in the Local Plan) to attract 100,000 more visitors a year. A significant proportion of these can be expected to use the A247.

Waverly B. C. has approved the development of 1,800 homes at Dunsfold which has the potential to feed traffic trying to avoid Guildford, onto the A247 to access the A3 (not referenced in the Local Plan).

B.x. Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle width in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

D. Cumulative impact of changes – My Objections

Changes to the Plan have done nothing to alleviate the problems (particularly of traffic and congestion) raised in residents’ previous responses. Indeed it is now clear that the problems will be made much worse. There do not appear to be any changes which would be of benefit to the Clandons and indeed the cumulative effect of what is in the Plan and
some external factors not in the Plan will have a much worse impact on the A247 through West Clandon and Send than the 2016 draft. Note that the A247 is the only road over the Guildford to Waterloo railway, North of Guildford that doesn’t involve travelling through the town centre.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10788</th>
<th>Respondent: 8892801 / Richard Hall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partially as a result of the planning controls but also as a result of topography with large areas forming flood plains draining ultimately to the Mole and Wey and limited crossing points of these rivers and streams the area has limited road infrastructure and Surrey County Council acknowledged this recently saying the area had lanes not road without the usual architecture of drainage and highway design found in sustainable urban areas. The width of the roads is limited and without wide scale compulsory purchase and reconstruction upgrading of these roads to a safe and sustainable design is not possible and the complexity of such a scheme is not deliverable.

The village school was unable to accept either of our children with the only option available, 20 minutes away at Merrow and the level of subscription is unlikely to abate. The medical centre is also full and the retail parades maintain a balance of facilities.

The community infrastructure is stressed but balanced with roads that already present significant risks to pedestrians and other users. Wing mirror strikes of pedestrians are all too frequent as cars pass along the Ockham Road North and cars have to mount the pavement to let HGV traffic pass. The village has been cut off by flooding from the A3 during exceptional rainfall and these weather events are likely to increase.

The classification of Ockham Road North and South as an "A" class road is out of necessity rather than design, the necessity being that no other route is available to designate, it is now unsafe and in need of traffic calming measures and the proposals to place a further burden on it by permitting a substantial increase in local development is not tenable.

The railway line is held out as a possibility of sustainable transport but each train is full as it leaves Horsley each weekday morning with passengers having to standing from Effingham and Cobham for nearly three quarters of an hour to London and passengers unable to board by Surbiton. It is noticeable that more passengers travelling from Guildford are electing to use this line as Guildford grows and the mainline is overwhelmed. The capacity needs to be protected for those travelling further from the sustainable centre of Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16983</th>
<th>Respondent: 8893057 / Dianne Garnett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 We object to policy II Infrastructure and delivery
1.2 Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

1.3 The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

1.4 The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

1.5 Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.

1.6 This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

1.7 The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints.

1.8 The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model.

1.9 Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods.

1.10 Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan.

1.11 The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network.

1.12 It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below.
1.13 In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5...indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’.

1.14 The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”.

1.15 Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided.

1.16 The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR:1.16.1 Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road /Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3)1.16.2 Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8).1.16.3 Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14).1.16.4 Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction.1.16.5 Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction).1.16.6 Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane.1.16.7 Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

1.17 The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen.

1.18 The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comments on Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12613  **Respondent:** 8894657 / Jacob's Well Residents' Association (Janet Smith)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is vital that stringent measures are put in place to ensure that infrastructure improvements are put in place to ensure that infrastructure improvements

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3388  **Respondent:** 8895233 / Clare Axten  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9111  **Respondent:** 8895265 / Peter Wood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to stretching Infrastructure to breaking point: Local services are already under strain and a significant increase in population would stretch these beyond breaking point. These include

- Parking at local station: parking after rush hour is already difficult;
- Doctor's surgery: where getting appointments is already difficult
- Local schools: where it is already difficult to get places
- Additional traffic on roads: sadly I already refuse to let allow my children walk to the local shops as there are already many vehicles drives too quickly along these narrow village roads - even more will increase the risk of serious accidents; and surrounding major roads (A3/M25) already suffer from long delays throughout rush hour but also at weekends and are not able to cope with additional demand with further expanding capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**
9. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time.

In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of
large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14759  Respondent: 8896161 / Carol Wilson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT to the Plan making proposals for areas of development without simultaneously making plans for the necessary infrastructure to be in place at the time it would be needed. Consequently I submit that the Plan is severely flawed. In many cases it is unclear if the improvements would ever be made – so Green Belt would be sacrificed unnecessarily.

The choice of large potential sites for building seems to be preferred by GBC possibly so as to get funding for infrastructure. I object to this sacrifice of beautiful land for huge housing estates. We do not need them. Small is what we need.

It seems that the effect on all of the infrastructure of a 77% increase in homes in Ockham and the Horsleys has not been considered or the cost calculated properly. We are at capacity already in terms of:

State Schools - all full. Private schools expensive and traffic problem from non-locals

Medical services – both GP and Hospital – long waiting times for both, as full

Station parking – no spaces by 9.00am on weekdays. Same at Effingham.
Sewage – pipes old and falling apart, our road (Pincott Lane) has to have 6 monthly clean and repair. Overflows frequently as poor fall and easily blocked. Raw sewage goes straight into the water courses. There is no capacity downstream at the sewage works.

Roads – small unlit country roads with no paths – we like this. Not suitable for influx of thousands of extra cars. (2 per household)

Surface water drainage – with a natural spring line where the chalk meets the clay, and poor flow we have regular flooding of roads. Ripley Lane and Ockham Road have been closed regularly after rain over recent years.

Parking at shops – Difficult now, impossible with 70% increase in numbers. Even worse if the ‘centre’ is enlarged – no room for that anyway.

The area will sink under the load if these proposals are implemented. The whole area would be ruined for ever.

The County Council has said it has no funds available to cover upgrades.

We cannot cope with the increased housing proposed in the Horsley area, let alone with Wisley Airfield as well.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: pslp171/1026  **Respondent:** 8896161 / Carol Wilson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Infrastructure will not be in place for most proposed developments. In my own area of Horsley, the train station parking, doctors surgery, schools, sewage, parking and so on are at capacity and the roads are congested.

Guildford often gridlocks when the A3 is blocked.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10840  **Respondent:** 8896929 / Desmond Finnan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the lack of common sense being applied to this suggested plan insofar as our infrastructure cannot take many more houses. Schools are full, car parks are full already and the doctors’ surgery has a long appointment wait time. Also, what about the flooding in Horsley, at the moment not under control?

When I lived in Cobham I sometimes could not park at the shops and drove home again empty-handed. This is a sorry way to live.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4422  Respondent: 8897377 / Jan Jewers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

15. I object to the lack of planned infrastructure for local roads, air quality, public transport, and the reliance of the ‘developer’ to provide all this

16. I object to the increased population numbers which will overwhelm local healthcare, policing and social welfare facilities

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7121  Respondent: 8897473 / John Fluker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Dealing with some of the detail of the current Local Plan my further objections are as follows:

Local infrastructure in both the Horsleys is already at or over capacity e.g. schools, surgeries, dentists, water, sewage, drainage, roads etc]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4384  Respondent: 8897505 / Michael Dickins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Be limited in size by the availability of all necessary local facilities, infrastructure and transport which is already inadequate. The Draft Plan contains insufficient proposals to increase the schooling, roads and transport, medical facilities, parking, drainage, mains utilities or any other infrastructure required to avoid serious over-use and overcrowding which will be caused by the increase in dwellings and residents in Horsley. At the same time it proposes to remove the only hotel in the village, and the insertion of office space, retail and leisure facilities (a Rural District Centre) which will completely change the character of the villages, and attract yet more traffic. Parking spaces at local shops, the medical centre, Village Hall and railway stations are already at a premium with no room for expansion.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4392  Respondent: 8897505 / Michael Dickins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Any development which strains the existing fragile infrastructure of local and much-prized villages and communities
• Any development which destroys existing facilities and amenities, including much-needed local hotels (A36)

I suggest the Borough re-examines and justifies their estimates for sustainable development, identifies more sensible and sustainable sites for limited expansion, and drops all proposals for any dense or significant developments over, or transfer out of, existing valued green belt land.

If they do not, existing elected representatives in central government, the county, the borough or the parish who support this Plan will not receive my vote in the future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13451  Respondent: 8897857 / Helen Lewis  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Whilst the individual proposals A36 and A37 look modest in size, when taken together with the other sites proposed for the Horsleys (A38-41), the total number of houses proposed is too high for these rural villages. It would have been clear to see, if GBC had merged the separate maps and presented them as one overall picture for clarity. Object strongly therefore to Site allocations A36-A41. Not only are they proposed for sites currently within the Greenbelt, but the infrastructure of the villages cannot support this quantity of new housing. We already have insufficient parking at the station, overstretched and archaic waste water removal systems (which apparently the water board wont be able to sort for several years for the current usage alone – has anyone from GBC actually witnessed the flooding that regularly occurs from sudden downpours for example?…and climate change predicts this will keep happening!), overstretched medical facilities, and overstretched schools. The heavy plant required for such large building proposals will further damage the road infrastructure, which GBC already struggles to maintain (largely due to water damage resultant from high water tables and poor waste water capacity)

The housing density of the proposed sites is also far too great and completely out of character with the current building density and style of the villages. For example, the proposed 100 houses for policy A39 would occupy less space than about half the number of pre-existing houses adjacent to this site. Given that these houses would presumably be targeted by families (due to proximity to the Raleigh school for example) the ensuing garden space for children would be woefully small for example. And the school itself could not support the increased numbers – People who have chosen to live in a village and school their children here have done so wanting a village school environment – they do not wish the school to be doubled in size because the village has been forced to double in size. These proposals would potentially harm the
quality of education the children of our villages receive. The A38 site proposed would mar the open feel of the current village of West Horsley, and would therefore detrimentally impact the village. The Site A36 is likely to change the visual entrance to East Horsley detrimentally, and this right-angled bend already suffers severe congestion at peak times – building here will undoubtedly exacerbate this unless very careful and thoughtful traffic flow measures are considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13456</th>
<th>Respondent: 8897857 / Helen Lewis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Adding to the argument against the housing proposals based on lack of adequate infrastructure, is the argument concerning safety to road users. The village roads are narrow in places and there is already a problem with oversized lorries using our villages for the building work currently active in both West and East Horsley. The danger to current road users from the vastly increased traffic through the villages, both in terms of the heavy lorries that will be required to undertake the developments proposed in the current draft local plan and the subsequent increase in number of cars on the roads, will be exacerbated. GBC is surely aware of the great and ever-increasing number of recreational cyclists using our village roads and surrounding lanes, especially after the Olympic route through Surrey promoted this sport. Developmental building as proposed, ensuing road closures which are bound to happen, heavy plant using the roads (often discourteously and at speed) and causing damage to the road surfaces, will all contribute to increasing the hazards for cyclists as well as causing misery and congestion for village inhabitants/drivers on these roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7251</th>
<th>Respondent: 8898081 / Sarah Bowe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a local resident - not an unreasonable one, in that I do not object in principle to a degree of redevelopment in the area. However, I am concerned at the scale of the current proposals and the apparent lack of attention to any improvement in local infrastructure that would be required for even a reasonable amount of redevelopment and, as a result, object strongly to the proposals in the New Guildford Local Plan, in particular:

Medical Facilities

The Horsley Medical Centre is overwhelmed and it is already impossible to get an appointment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/2211</th>
<th>Respondent: 8898145 / Michael Poole</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transport, parking, roads and services in the area are stretched to breaking point in rush hour and matters like air pollution are still not being adequately addressed

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to the complete lack of any infrastructure proposal to support the increase in housing. The local schools in Send and Ripley are over capacity and were, in 2014, when the previous Plan was promoted. There is only one doctor's surgery which covers the Send and Ripley areas. It was at capacity in 2014, and still is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

The Local Plan does propose some additional schools but they seem insufficient to address the scale of development.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Horsleys’ schools, roads, car parks, drainage, medical practice and local facilities are already fully stretched by existing demands. It is more than likely that additional pressure resulting from 590+ new houses could not be absorbed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2660  **Respondent:** 8900577 / Ann-Marie Bound  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The ensuing increase in traffic along wholly unsuitable narrow lanes will lead to a increased likelihood of accidents with the many cyclists enjoying this area.

Huge demand will be placed on local services which are already stretched.

It will turn this part of Surrey into another anonymous urban sprawl.
With greater creativity and thought, I am sure a balance can be achieved between the needs for housing and preserving the countryside for future generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16326  Respondent: 8900641 / Caroline Carr  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the borough. The roads around this area are not capable of carrying the amount of traffic which this sort of development would bring; Send is already burdened with traffic and local transport problems. There is also a lack of parking at local stations already without adding additional cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4255  Respondent: 8900705 / Susan Fuller  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

   Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

   Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

   I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

   Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. The A247 in particular is narrow and twisting and, in places, impossible for two large vehicles to pass each other. The footpaths are narrow and, therefore, dangerous for pedestrians. This country lane through a pretty village is already used by far too great a volume of traffic and it cannot take any more.

   With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision for any increased capacity for Guildford hospitals. Where is this assessed and remedied? The Royal Surrey is already extremely busy causing inevitable delays in patients being treated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8059  Respondent: 8901089 / Michael Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. The plan’s commitment to build housing across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment, which no one will believe will happen and for which there are no funds, or else a catastrophic collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communication services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8060  Respondent: 8901185 / Annette Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. The plan’s commitment to build housing across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment, which no one will believe will happen and for which there are no funds, or else a catastrophic collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communication services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4116   Respondent: 8901633 / Duncan Gray   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Raleigh school is full in northcote crescent, and doesn’t have room for any more classrooms or kids. Any more cars going down there for drop off would cause gridlock.

At The Medical centre East Horsley, parking is already impossible and almost as hard as getting an appointment, it can’t take any more patients in my view and the small road to it cannot take any more cars.

The new plan is very flawed and ill thought through with regards to East and West Horsley in particular, please build at slyford where you have all the room in the world and its near to the employment area of Guildford it has good public transport and brand new schools with room for expansion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• I object to the increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with increased visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school would add further congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without Infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25.
• I object to the lack of suitable public transport. There is no regular bus service to the local railstations of Effingham Junction and Horsley; these stations cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic, and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8167  Respondent: 8902465 / Linda Slater  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY) • Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.

• Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
• Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.

• Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
• No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8024  Respondent: 8902593 / Edward Kurk  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The scale of development in East and West Horsley

The Local Plan has earmarked six main development sites in these two villages which would result in a total of 533 new houses as well as a further 60 houses on smaller sites within East and West Horsley. This represents an increase of over 20% in the number of dwellings and would place an intolerable burden on the existing infrastructure. All local facilities (such as roads, schools, surgeries, parking spaces for shopping etc.) are already under enormous pressure and further development on the proposed scale is wholly impractical.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14027  Respondent: 8903169 / Andrew Hooks  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposed scale of development in West Horsley will result in dramatic permanent change to the character of the area, and is unsustainable given the local infrastructure. The local schools are over-subscribed and full every year; the doctors surgery in East Horsley is invariably busy today and appointments hard to come by; the roads (especially Ockham Road North/South and East Lane) are very busy at peak times; and the basic services, especially sewerage/drainage, are already incapable of dealing with the current demand as the widespread flooding that invariably accompanies periods of heavy rainfall in the village shows (further development will mean more surface water runoff, and more immediate demand on outdated sewers and storm drains which in turn will mean more flash flood episodes around the village).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18526  Respondent: 8903265 / Susan Anderson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPP16/11838  Respondent: 8903841 / Anne Tutt  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure by way of energy, water & sewerage, roads & car parking, health services, schools and environmental services, is in some cases already stretched to the limit and it would be madness to give planning permission so they would exceed breaking point.  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11839  Respondent: 8903841 / Anne Tutt  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Public health issues have not been adequately addressed in these proposals, such as air quality, stress caused by difficulties getting doctor appointments, stress caused by traffic jams, potential for more road accidents due to many more vehicles using local lanes etc. The Council cannot knowingly take action which would decrease public health  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15037  Respondent: 8904129 / Elizabeth Ross  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)  
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.  
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.  
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.  
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.  
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past
through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
5.1 do not object to sensitive additional development for local residents and their families provided it is in keeping with local styles and public services AND LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE OF ROADS, TRANSPORT CAPABILITY AND DRAINAGE (PARTICULARLY SEWAGE TREATMENT) is provided. Thus I object to the disproportionate allocation of housing in this particular part of the borough. Indeed, over 23% of the Plan's new housing is proposed in the immediate localities of Ockham, Ripley, Send and the Horsleys (of which 65% is allocated to the former Wisley Airport an area that at present has only 0.3% of the population of GBC).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. POLICY II

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will
cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/564</th>
<th>Respondent: 8904705 / Jonathan and Rosalyn Groocock</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not qualified to comment on the levels of affordable housing, sustainability, and climate change. But I would comment that the services in the Borough are already operating at capacity – the schools near us are full (we had to go private), the Medical Centre at East Horsley is full (we regularly have to wait up to a month to get a GP appointment, and the walk-in surgeries fill up before the doors even open), the traffic situation is poor and the train services are not geared towards a greatly increased local population. Were any development to proceed in the Horsley area I would suggest that the Council would need to upgrade the road network, parking facilities, medical facilities, schools, and rail links first. At most development should be heavily restricted to being within existing village boundaries and on brown field sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12130</th>
<th>Respondent: 8905505 / Rachel Folley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the regional expectation that ALL the local surrey villages on the A3 corridor will become an irreversible conurbation, which offers beds and limited infrastructure, limited opportunity for employment and congestion,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We must preserve our green and pleasant land, for environmental reasons, the flora and fauna, the cycle of life, leisure and quality of life; it is part of our heritage and the right of future generations. Our legacy should not resemble a concrete jungle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15076</th>
<th>Respondent: 8905537 / Christopher Ross</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road &amp; Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4634  **Respondent:** 8906113 / Sally Clarke  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Another issue I am concerned about is drainage. I understand that the existing drainage system will not be able to cope with the added burden on it from the many proposed houses. The foul drainage system will need to be upgraded to cope. Also, when there are heavy downpours, which in our changing climate seem to happen frequently, many of the local roads here flood. Vehicles on the Ockham Road North, for example, end up driving down the middle of the road to avoid the huge puddles running along large stretches of the road on both sides. With more traffic, vehicles will not be able to do this, leading to more cases of pedestrians getting soaked by the traffic passing at speed through the puddles, not to mention the harm that may be done to vehicles driving through the water, and the inconvenience of having to take a different route where flooding is impassable. I have been on the receiving end of such a soaking and seen others also get soaked by drivers! What does the council propose to do about this?

I am also concerned about parking and road safety. Where are all the additional cars going to park? There isn’t enough room for a big increase in the number of cars that will result from the proposed developments. Our roads will become too congested as well as polluted and it will become extremely difficult to find a parking place when needed. The shops and cafes will become overcrowded too. There will be a huge impact on our villages. The peaceful character of our villages will be destroyed by these proposed developments.

How will the medical facilities in this area cope? It is already much harder to get a doctor’s appointment in this area than it used to be where I previously lived in Wimbledon. With more houses, and therefore more people using the medical facilities, the doctors surgery won’t be able to cope. People will have to wait longer for appointments which could lead to an adverse affect on some people’s health. This is very worrying.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3675  **Respondent:** 8906177 / Peter & Robyn Cormack  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the fact that infrastructure (roads, doctors, schools) has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels. Nor have water supplies been adequately assessed, both in and out, in some of these low lying areas.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however,
assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically
dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a
key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large
infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing
conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns
over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if
at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been
identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing
residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and
sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages
Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon
existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will
stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends when hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk of injury to the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to, capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision for the increased capacity of Guildford hospital. Where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Increased traffic on the A3 will increase the bottleneck At Guildford and junction 10 of M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8473  Respondent: 8906881 / G Hartigan  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am extremely worried about the proposed plans for the Horsleys. More houses and people will put a huge strain on schools, medical facilities, roads and car parks which are already full. So many of us are still not on main drains and drainage is completely inadequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8474  Respondent: 8906881 / G Hartigan  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The scale of building in the Horsleys and the increased number of people would put a huge strain on all facilities and no sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes.

Please think very carefully before going ahead with any building.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8626  Respondent: 8907137 / Jennifer A. Milligan  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of planned infrastructure. Roads aside, there is no provision for these new residents – our local GP practices, hospitals and schools run at full capacity. With houses filling every spare piece of land no provision has been made for the supporting infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13808  Respondent: 8907457 / Russell Hills  Agent:
I object to there being no provision in the council's plans for minimal improvement in infrastructure in Horsley which I believe is presently only just sufficient for the existing population and which would require more policing, medical surgeries, transport in the event that further development went ahead. Recently village who pensioners I have spoken to elderly residents have expressed their distress at the prospect of being unable to park at the local shops as is difficult enough for them to do so already.

Sewerage is a cause for concern. With such a Substantial increase in housing with no improvement in sewers they could well burst as I believe they have in other developments of this sort leaving raw sewage floating above ground. Raw sewage has already been on the roads in Horsley.

I object also to the development of Horsley on the grounds of low water pressure which I believe already affects a fair number of properties and with an increased demand the situation is likely only to become worse.

I object to the increase in traffic which such a development will bring about. The small country roads are unlikely to cope with a significant increase in traffic. They are already potentially hazardous to both drivers, pedestrians and horse riders. A while ago the Parish Council removed the cat's eyes and painted side lines on the roads for pedestrians so that they could walk in the road if necessary (you know where I mean) where it is still pretty dangerous! Also there are a lot of horses kept in Horsley and being a country village horse riders regularly use the roads. I am told that riders have already found large trucks are 'spooking' their horses.

Within Horsley it only takes a moderate amount of rainfall to commonly render some of the main village roads impassable despite the authority’s best attempts to improve the drainage. I object to a large increase in local traffic which such a development would create which will potentially lead to worse even hold ups than usual. An significant increase in traffic will be tragic for the area traffic flow and horse riders alike.

I am extremely concerned for the large number of elderly people who have lived their most of their lives here. Such substantial changes in their environment could seriously affect their health (which it has in other areas of the UK) The stress that some of them would experience would be enormous!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/13810  | Respondent: 8907457 / Russell Hills  | Agent: |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

Also the re-siteing of the Raleigh School on a curved stretch of road opposite Greta Bank is a curious choice of location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/5806  | Respondent: 8907713 / S.J. Gilbert  | Agent: |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

---

Section page number: Page 288 of 1294
1. **Settlement Boundaries in The Horsleys**

The changes suggested for the settlement boundaries for East and West Horsley are not acceptable. The Horsleys do not have the infrastructure to cope with the increased numbers of houses that are proposed:

- The local schools, particularly the Raleigh School, are already full
- Parking at the local shops is already difficult
- The railway station car parks at Horsley and Effingham are already full
- It is difficult to get appointments at the local Doctors’ surgery and there is very limited parking there.
- The weather over the last few years has shown us what a terrible state our drainage is in giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains. Covering green fields in housing and concrete will lead to more flooding. For some weeks after Christmas 2013 we were unable to access the A3 from East Horsley without travelling along the A246 to Guildford because of flooding in Ockham Road North.
- More houses means more cars – usually at least 2 per house. The state of the roads in East and West Horsley is appalling and more cars will mean more potholes. The roads in this area were mostly built as country lanes. Ockham Road South in particular is already very dangerous with the present level of traffic and two lorries cannot pass each other – it is hard enough for two large 4-wheel-drive vehicles to pass let alone two lorries.
- Looking at the sites suggested for development in East and West Horsley it seems that the Plan intends to join the two villages into an urban conurbation thus destroying the different and rural characters of the two separate villages. The impact is magnified by the closeness of the Wisley Airport site affecting every single resident in East and West Horsley and all our local services and infrastructure which will NOT be able to cope

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16666  **Respondent:** 8907713 / S.J. Gilbert  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---

**Settlement Boundaries in The Horsleys – POLICY I1**

The changes suggested for the settlement boundaries for East and West Horsley are not acceptable. The Horsleys do not have the infrastructure to cope with the increased numbers of houses that are proposed:

- The local schools, particularly the Raleigh School, are already full
- Parking at the local shops is already difficult
- The railway station car parks at Horsley and Effingham are already full
- It is difficult to get appointments at the local Doctors’ surgery and there is very limited parking there.
- The weather over the last few years has shown us what a terrible state our drainage is in giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains. Covering green fields in housing and concrete will lead to more flooding. For some weeks after Christmas 2013 we were unable to access the A3 from East Horsley without travelling along the A246 to Guildford because of flooding in Ockham Road North.
• More houses means more cars – usually at least 2 per house. The state of the roads in East and West Horsley is appalling and more cars will mean more potholes. The roads in this area were mostly built as country lanes. Ockham Road South in particular is already very dangerous with the present level of traffic and two lorries cannot pass each other – it is hard enough for two large 4-wheel-drive vehicles to pass let alone two lorries.

• Looking at the sites suggested for development in East and West Horsley it seems that the Plan intends to join the two villages into an urban conurbation thus destroying the different and rural characters of the two separate villages. The impact is magnified by the closeness of the Wisley Airport site affecting every single resident in East and West Horsley and all our local services and infrastructure which will NOT be able to cope

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13825  Respondent: 8907809 / Sarah White  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Furthermore, construction would not stop at houses as more public buildings/services would have to be built to deal with the larger capacity of people; for example, already there are not enough local school places and children are having to be ferried to schools further afield and it can take a month to get a doctor's appointment at the medical centre, not to mention the extra traffic on the already pothole riddled roads of Surrey. I do hope that you will stop and think about the core issues and the consequences of your actions rather than blindly continuing to build on our beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17851  Respondent: 8907809 / Sarah White  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Local infrastructure (schools, roads, medical care, rail etc.) are already stretched to breaking point. Permission for any development proposal should only be given if they include the necessary infrastructure changes and these need to be scheduled for implementation before development, rather than as an afterthought as is currently the case.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4657  Respondent: 8907905 / G.A. Phillips  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
4. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.

I object to lack of infrastructure for the sites in and around Send. Many of the utilities in the area are at or very close to their maximum capacity, such as the electrical network and main drainage/sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no developments in this village. The local Send Medical Centre is now operating at full capacity, are they any plans to increase this service?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9486  Respondent: 8908193 / David Wyatt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Whatever the final housing number agreed for the new Local Plan there must be a commitment from GBC to deliver (in entirety) the necessary infrastructure to support this increase. Roads, doctors, schools etc must all be delivered (by the developers if required) before any new houses are permitted to be occupied or sold. The phrase "timely provision" referred to in Policies I1 & I2 must be understood to mean “before occupation of any new houses”. In particular for Ash & Tongham this would mean LRN9 - LRN16 and in particular LRN21 from Appendix C should all be delivered prior to any further new housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1000  Respondent: 8909185 / Jamie Hogg  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the lack of immediate provision of new schools.
• I object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.
• I object to the burden the developments would put on the current road networks.
• I object to the proposed changes to the road access to the A3 at Burtncommon. The layout is confused and will lead to gridlock as traffic attempts to leave the A3 south and clashes with traffic on the Clandon Road.
• I object to the lack of evidence measuring traffic flows now and with the additional traffic created from the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18428  Respondent: 8909761 / Diana Grover  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the lack of immediate provision of new schools.
• I object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.
• I object to the burden the developments would put on the current road networks.
• I object to the proposed changes to the road access to the A3 at Burtncommon. The layout is confused and will lead to gridlock as traffic attempts to leave the A3 south and clashes with traffic on the Clandon Road.
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11728  **Respondent:** 8910145 / Mr G.W. & Mrs A.C. Spratt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7898  **Respondent:** 8911777 / Alan Bowley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

To impose such a huge increase in the number of homes would be madness. Our country lanes would not be able to cope with the increased traffic without widening and new roads would simply add to the problem, many of them subject to flooding. Drainage would have to be renewed on a large scale.
There are also existing problems with meeting the increasing places in our few schools; our medical services are stretched to their limit; and parking for our few shops is getting worse. Bus and rail services would also have to be revised to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2680  Respondent: 8913985 / Lynda Newland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to the lack of provision for doctors surgeries which are already at capacity in Send

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2683  Respondent: 8913985 / Lynda Newland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to the lack of provision for schools in the Send area. Send School is currently being increased in size to cope with current numbers and will not cope with the extra numbers the extra development will generate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15970  Respondent: 8914465 / John & Elizabeth Maycock  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The lack of primary school places in West Horsley is already clear. The Raleigh School is already full every year. Even if the school moves site, as has apparently been proposed, this is not going to happen in sufficient time to solve the places problem created by the new developments and in its own way will add to the other problems under discussion - especially road traffic. Howard of Effingham secondary places are also limited and, in any event, create transport requirements. The two private schools in The Horsleys are well patronised already and again already pose their own traffic problems for the villages.

There is no specific provision in the Local Plan for an increase in school places and it is deficient in the respect. I object to this lack of policy, which is a necessity if increasing the population in the villages

Medical Facilities
The existing practice in East Horsley is almost at capacity now. The proposed population increase in the Local Plan across the Borough exceeds Government ONS forecasts. It must also mean that some enlargement of the Royal Surrey Hospital will also soon be necessary. Against all of these obvious consequences of the proposed developments, the Infrastructure Development Plan only refers to a possible extension to the medical practice in East Horsley.

I object to the lack of policy in this area.

Drainage

The size of developments proposed will impose a burden on the current drainage infrastructure. I understand that there have already been sewerage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North/Green Lane area. Surface water drainage across the West Horsley Parish is already overloaded as can be seen during any heavy downpour and prolonged rain brings flooding very quickly. The consequence of more development is more surface water run off which will compound the problems. A serious upgrade across the two villages is necessary now and will be essential if these developments are to take place.

I understand that Thames Water has already advised Guildford Borough Council that the area’s waste water network is unlikely to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. I further understand that the foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will need to be upgraded to cope and that Thames Water requires a 2-3 year lead time to deal with this after it has obtained the necessary planning permissions to do the work.

I object to the lack of any positive proposals in this area of infrastructure. It is not credible to propose the developments set out in the Local Plan without putting forward positive proposals for the requisite improvements to infrastructure. Pious hope is purely political expediency.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4334  Respondent: 8916001 / Ockham Parish Council (Peter Bevan)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4. New houses, schools and services should be developed in or adjacent to areas of actual demand and not in relatively remote areas which inevitably and unnecessarily result in major increases in travel requirements from home to work, work to home, home to school, etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7743  Respondent: 8916001 / Ockham Parish Council (Peter Bevan)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. New houses, schools and services should be developed in or adjacent to areas of actual demand and not in relatively remote areas which inevitably and unnecessarily result in major increases in travel requirements from home to work, work to home, home to school, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4563  Respondent: 8916353 / John Franklin  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 I object to the planned mass housing additions within East and West Horsley, totalling 550 houses. The existing schools, medical facilities, shops, transport etc will not cope, and any attempt to satisfy the horrendous increase in demand will destroy the existing ambience of the 2 villages.

7 Further to 6, where would all the extra facilities so required be sited? The road system for the two villages is already inadequate, and lots of residents do not want the character of the villages changed to be that of a 'New Town', like Harlow or Bracknell.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16575  Respondent: 8917377 / Nick and Fiona Hardman  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The local infrastructure cannot cope with a significant increase in housing stock and therefore population. The local schools and medical centre are oversubscribed. The roads and pavements are suited to a small rural community. The proposal looks to increase the housing in West Horsley by 35%. This is totally unacceptable and the village infrastructure cannot cope with an increase of this magnitude.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1559  Respondent: 8917793 / Alan Pickup  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is inadequate provision of infrastructure investment across the borough provided in this local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
A46 & A47

I am happy to support the removal from the Plan of these two sites as the Council obviously now agrees with residents that the infrastructure to cope with developments on this scale is totally inadequate, particularly considering the roads involved (Westwood Lane is a C road and Glaziers Lane a D road), sewage, long term flooding problems, electricity supply and healthcare. The sites in question are Green Belt land which is important to protect the environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Schools/other facilities**

- Doctors’ appointments hard to access
- State schools already oversubscribed
- Local parking at capacity all the time

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13226  **Respondent:** 8919009 / Andrew Kukielka  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
POLICY 11/12/13 Infrastructure and delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport's Road Investment Strategy, and Sustainable Transport

OBJECT.

The infrastructure of East Horsley is the main reason for objecting to the Council's proposals. The roads are already congested without the additional new homes and subsequent increased usage. They are generally narrow, with potholes, cracks and other signs of wear. During heavy rains, the drains block and flooding results. The pavements do not run along every road through the village, where they do, they are narrow and often cracked and uneven. The local primary school (the Raleigh) is already at capacity, resulting in local children being sent miles from their homes for schooling. In addition, Horsley Medical Centre is at capacity. How can 593 new homes (from the 11 development sites identified for East and West Horsley) be shoe-horned into such a village without disastrous results? The proposals are unsustainable because they do not meet the objective of providing infrastructure to support the new homes. Regarding Wisley Airfield, it is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and simply call them sustainable. Shifting to cycling and walking discriminates against vulnerable members of the community - the disabled, those with small children, the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill. Alternatives impact on already congested roads or over-subscribed peak hour rail services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17840  Respondent: 8920129 / Allan Siva  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3

The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. In reality “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them. It is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley Airfield site, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

I therefore OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11987  Respondent: 8921377 / Paul Maycox  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will
cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13011</th>
<th>Respondent: 8921569 / Steven Cliff</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ripley and surrounding areas already suffer from severe congestion all day long, especially along Newark Lane and Rose Lane where these junction with Ripley High Street. Any development in and around Ripley, let alone development of a disproportionate scale such as proposed under The Plan will add to this congestion. There is no sustainable strategy in The Plan for enhancing capacity on local roads.

Moreover, country lanes around Ripley and surrounding villages are narrow with road surfaces in poor condition. I object because the development proposed in The Plan will cause more traffic to use these narrow roads with a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

There is already insufficient parking space in Ripley. Development in and around Ripley will result in more congestion and parking problems.

Ripley has been a historic hub for cyclists for some 150 years and is on the iconic “Olympic Cycling Route” used by hundreds of cyclists on the way to the Surrey Hills. Ripley and surrounding villages regularly host vast numbers of cyclists – especially for the annual London-Surrey Classic, with tens of thousands of amateurs passing through the village followed by a top level professional cycle race. It is unbelievable that Guildford Borough Council should propose a local plan which, by increasing road traffic on rural roads, risks increasing road accidents involving cyclists, thereby jeopardising our Olympic legacy.

The rural roads do not have kerbs or pedestrian footpaths. These roads are already dangerous for pedestrians and risk becoming even more so due to increased traffic levels as a result of the proposed levels of development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13013</th>
<th>Respondent: 8921569 / Steven Cliff</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The delivery of improvements to infrastructure is required in conjunction with development in accordance with Policy I1. The planning of infrastructure is, in my opinion, inadequate and I have concerns that the planned infrastructure projects will happen at all.

The Garlick’s Arch site (A43) is a major development, but no infrastructure projects are included in the Infrastructure Schedule. The lives of local people will be adversely impacted by the lack of planning for infrastructure improvements prior to development.

In particular, with utilities in Ripley and Send at, or very close to capacity (electrical network and sewers) there should be no major development in or around these villages before such utilities are improved.

It is already difficult to get an appointment at the Villages Medical Centre, Send and I fear that extra housing will result in services being overwhelmed. Police services will also be overstretched if the proposed 13,860 homes are built during the plan period.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8123  **Respondent:** 8921793 / Graham Richings  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Traffic Management**

At certain times of day the two main roads, A3 Portsmouth Road and A31 Hog's Back are at saturation point and stationary without the addition of just under two thousand houses on Blackwell Farm, with views to and from an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This is Green Belt land in a sensitive area and should not in my view ever be built on. The views from this land are spectacular and there is no way that properties built here will ever be in the truly affordable price range which in any case has a relevance to the area of build. It lays very close to the University of Surrey and its Research Park, the latter in the Manor Farm area abutting Blackwell Farm. Currently in the Guildford Borough area there are about 1500 private houses rented out to students and the stock of this type of property is on the increase to the detriment of families requiring homes. This University must provide a lot more accommodation on its own land for which it already has planning permission. This Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be preserved for future generations.

There is no way of stopping many of the new houses being proposed from being bought up by landlords/investors to rent to even more students. This is another good reason for not allowing lots more houses to be built near this University. There is a lack of children growing up in this area due to the number of houses let to students and more accommodation must be built on University land if that organisation wants to keep on expanding in terms of students and as an institution. They must act responsibly and cater for their own needs by doing more building of accommodation for students, thus freeing up houses for families.

Every morning traffic queues across the A31 Hog's Back and is normally stationary towards Guildford. (I have BBC traffic recordings of this happening on a daily basis). To build just short of 2,000 houses and add this to the mix is a ridiculous suggestion. There are developments going on and planned for the future in the Aldershot and Farnborough areas that will place more traffic on the already busy A31 road and make matters worse. Even more reason not to aggravate the situation on the approaches to Guildford. Currently this traffic problem is driving traffic onto minor roads in housing estates. Future development in this area is unsustainable because of traffic flows even now. There must be massive infrastructure improvements to our road system BEFORE any development takes place.

In connection with any approved development at Blackwell Farm there are proposals to put in a junction just west of the A3 and on the A31 near Down Place. In view of the fact that in the mornings traffic is already stationary, sometimes for
miles, a traffic light controlled junction at this location can only just extend traffic queues making matters much much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13224  **Respondent:** 8921857 / Claire Kukielka  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY II**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local
road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10135  Respondent: 8923777 / Andrew Mitchell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Me and my two children are keen cyclists. Our house is situated on the A247 and we and cycle on this road every day. The road is already too busy and not suited to the current volume of traffic and LGVs. It’s only a matter of time before someone is knocked off their bike and killed on The Street.

I also strongly object against the need for any additional new schools and doctor’s surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17799  **Respondent:** 8923777 / Andrew Mitchell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Infrastructure already overloaded: drains, water supply, medical facilities and our roads are already inadequate and could not possibly cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes would lead to flood risk here and downstream, along the Wey and Thames.

The sewerage system is already inadequate as many will testify. To give just one instance, and there are many, after heavy rain (and not "exceptional rain") the main sewer running parallel to Ockham Road overflows and a manhole cover in a field in Slade Farm is displaced, depositing raw sewage in the field and adjacent ditch.

The single school in West Horsley is already very much over-subscribed, with further development meaning even more existing residents' children would not be eligible. The knock-on effect of the proposed development would be greatly increased traffic on local roads for school runs to outlying schools.

The single medical centre shared between the Horsleys is similarly over-subscribed and resources and staff overstretched. Such a significant increase in population as proposed would stretch this to breaking point.

Parking spaces near the shops of the Horsleys are very limited, as they are at the station. The impact of such a disproportionate increase in population as proposed would overstretch these facilities even further, make it difficult if not impossible for many residents, including those older and infirm who depend on them, to go to the shops, medical centre and chemist.

The Street, from the A246 to West Horsley, is very narrow, and could not be widened. This road is already difficult to negotiate and even dangerous in places for other drivers when used by buses, lorries and other large vehicles, particularly at night and in bad weather. This would be exacerbated by the inevitable increase in traffic which would result if the proposed development were to take place.

This road is not only a problem for drivers, it is even more dangerous for pedestrians. On these narrow stretches the pavements also are very narrow; it is impossible to walk two abreast and so a particular problem for those with children and for wheelchairs. Like the road itself, the pavements could not be widened.

There is such severe flooding in Ripley Lane that it is completely impassable several times a year. There is also frequent severe flooding after heavy rain on The Street, East Lane, and Long Reach, so much so that they are impassable to anything other than a 4x4.

Designation of Station Parade as District Centre This shows a lack of understanding of the nature of the village centre and would endanger its character by potential future urbanisation.

Proposal for large mixed development on former Wisley Airfield The potential impact on the Horsley villages and further afield would be massive and damaging in terms of character

I object to the proposed removal of the Former Wisley Airfield (FWA/TFM) from the Green Belt. The site serves a vital role in protecting against urban sprawl from London. Development on the site would create an urban corridor stretching from London to Guildford.

2,000+ dwelling development, with urban-style buildings up to five storeys high and a population density higher than most London boroughs.

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety because of the following:

The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to expect reduced reliance on the private car.
The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.

The congestion this traffic would cause not only on the narrow rural roads in Ockham but also the knock-on effect on the immediate and wider local area, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.

The danger this traffic would pose to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the lack of cycling paths and pedestrian footpaths and the space to provide them.

The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

I object to the continued inclusion in the plan of a site - the former Wisley Airfield - where the planning application has already been unanimously rejected by GBC’s Planning Committee.

(After 14 months of consideration, and various extensions and amendments, Wisley Property Investments Ltd’s planning application was unanimously rejected by GBC on 8th April 2016 on the recommendation of GBC Planning Officers, who cited the same grave concerns highlighted in this letter).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5779  Respondent: 8924577 / Charles Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested.

Only today 12th July, 2016 there was a serious collision of two cars at a narrow point of the A247 in West Clandon where both cars ended up on the pavement. The collision happened shortly after 9:00 – I know this because my wife had just walked past this exact point only moments before on her way to school with our 3 children. It doesn’t bear thinking about what would have happened if the crash had happened a few minutes earlier…..These narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians AND you have given no consideration to this point.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5789  Respondent: 8924577 / Charles Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:
   1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
   2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
   3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
   4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
   5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
   6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Schools:

Local schools are already at capacity – where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project.

There is talk of a new school at a site near to Lollesworth lane west Horsley, but this should have been talked about well before the local plan went out for consultation.

### Medical facilities:

Similar situation to the schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to any development without the necessary infrastructure being put in place prior to development. I object to developments not providing their planned infrastructure, i.e. schools, health centres as part of the development, prior to properties being sold.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object because the infrastructure proposals are inadequate. Where are the new roads going to come from?

1. I object because the medical services will be under increased strain. It is difficult getting a doctors appointment as it is.

1. I object because the parking at the railway station will be overwhelmed.

1. I object because the parking provision at the village centre will be unable to cope.

10. I object because local schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object because the infrastructure is already overloaded.

Local Schools are full. Medical facilities stretched. Drainage is inadequate, roads and car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements. Large increases in the volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11906  Respondent: 8927905 / Jacqueline M Fish  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure

In many aspects the infrastructure of the Horsleys is already overloaded. Local Schools are full, the medical centre is stretched, drainage is inadequate. Traffic, parking and rail routes are already heavily congested. There is little scope for improvement currently and the scale of development proposed is completely out of all proportion to the facilities available and the ability to increase those facilities. I note that in the proposal for 2,000 houses on Wisley airfield they identify Horsley station as a transport link. There is no provision in the Local Plan to improve this infrastructure in proportion to the proposed building.

I urge the Council to revisit the housing numbers, utilize brownfield sites for housing rather than green fields and critically to fulfil their election commitment to protect the Green Belt and to retain the Horsleys within it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17002  Respondent: 8927905 / Jacqueline M Fish  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure

In many aspects the infrastructure of the Horsleys is already overloaded. Local Schools are full, the medical centre is stretched, drainage is inadequate. Traffic, parking and rail routes are already heavily congested. There is little scope for improvement currently and the scale of development proposed is completely out of all proportion to the facilities available and the ability to increase those facilities. I note that in the proposal for 2,000 houses on Wisley airfield they identify Horsley station as a transport link. There is no provision in the Local Plan to improve this infrastructure in proportion to the proposed building.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11711  Respondent: 8928033 / P. Richardson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11712  Respondent: 8928033 / P. Richardson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5720  **Respondent:** 8928161 / Jan Brophy  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The infrastructure in the Horsleys and Ockham are already in overload. The local schools are full and the medical facilities are Drainage in inadequate and roads and car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5722  **Respondent:** 8928161 / Jan Brophy  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the disproportionate allocation of housing in the immediate localities of Ockham, Ripley, Send and the Horsleys.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5727  **Respondent:** 8928161 / Jan Brophy  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---
I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the Wisley development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.
2. The increased volume of car A proposed development of around 2,600 homes in the Horsleys and Ockham would result in an estimated 5,000 additional cars on the roads.
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles Including increased bus and HGV movements.
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the Wisley site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads.
6. The lack of suitable public The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11936  Respondent: 8928289 / Trevor Skerritt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11938  Respondent: 8928289 / Trevor Skerritt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/2385  Respondent: 8928961 / Sue Reeve  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Inadequate Infrastructure

Schools:

Many complaints have been made against former drafts of this Local Plan that the infrastructure will not cope with such a huge building regime and we received platitudes from the planning department that developers will not be allowed to
Exceptions to the Duty to Cooperate

proceed unless certain provisions are in place. We all know that no developer will provide a school before they have built
and sold a certain number of houses, but where do children go in the meantime? All local schools are full. This provision
is still not addressed.

This is a chicken and egg situation. I live in East Horsley. Any development in the Horsleys and Ripley and at Three
Farms Meadow (former Wisley Airfield) will seriously affect our villages. Should the developments in the Horsleys,
although huge by village proportions, go ahead, will these smaller developers be expected to provide new primary and
secondary school places for the children who live in their houses? Or will the developers at Wisley be expected to provide
these school places as they are clearly going to make vastly more profit that the smaller developers? Has anyone
considered the situation as a whole? Is one person going to be appointed as project manager to oversee all of the
developments in the Borough and be responsible to ensure infrastructure is in place when it is needed? Will this project
Manager have the power to enforce any infrastructure projects?

Medical

We recently had a village AGM and a representative from the local Doctors Surgery repeatedly told us that recruiting
GPs is an impossible task as they cannot afford to live here. I am sure this is equally true in other parts of the Borough.
Recent recruits had been very fortunate in that the partner of the proposed GP had been relocated to the area. This is no
way to ensure an adequate supply of local GPs. Similarly can the Royal Surrey County Hospital cope with an increased
population caused by an extra 12,500 houses in Guildford Borough alone?

Roads and transport

Much has been said about the inability of local roads to cope with any increase in traffic. The size and condition of the
roads has not changed and local station and shop parking is already at saturation point. Locally the bus service is non-
existent and therefore will not help alleviate the number of cars on the road. No sensible solutions have been proposed.

Air Quality

A huge increase in road traffic, and there is no doubt that development on this scale which bring huge increases in car
numbers to Guildford Borough, will only cause the air quality to reduce further. Much of the major development is along
the A3 trunk road which is already renowned for its poor air quality, particularly at the A3/M25 interchange and at the
section on the A3 from Send going through Guildford to beyond the A31. We already have daily very long queues on the
A3 going into Guildford – this will only get much worse and the air quality will deteriorate ever more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
EHPC believes there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

We would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools.

Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, EHPC believes that this needs to be done earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s.

EHPC believes that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

EHPC accordingly OBJECTS to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. It further OBJECTS to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/89  Respondent: 8929057 / East Horsley Parish Council (Nick Clemens)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy D1 provides the general policy framework for infrastructure development in the borough proposed in the local plan, including the accompanying Infrastructure Schedule set out in Appendix C.

As we have detailed in our previous letter of 13th June 2016, EHPC considers the level of investment proposed in the plan to be totally inadequate in meeting the serious deficiencies in infrastructure across the borough. Moreover, where significant investment is specified in the Infrastructure Schedule in many cases it is unclear whether public sector funding is going to become available to support the level of investment needed: for most major infrastructure projects funding from developers will typically not be sufficient but until such infrastructure is in place many of the larger developments proposed in the Local Plan will not be sustainable.

Other than a few specific changes consequential on the removal of certain projects in the light of the reduced housing target, there are only minor changes made to the infrastructure proposals in the 2017 version of the GBC Local Plan. These changes totally fail to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure, nor meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments. Accordingly:

**EHPC strongly OBJECTS to the inadequate provision of infrastructure investment across the borough provided for in the local plan.**

Concluding remarks:

As we have set out in this letter, EHPC has major concerns about the revised 2017 Local Plan in general, in particular the excessively high housing targets that are being set, the failure to recognise the constraints to this development and the large-scale destruction of Green Belt land particularly in its most vulnerable areas in the north east of the borough. Accordingly:

**EHPC strongly OBJECTS to the revised 201.7 Local Plan**

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4458  Respondent: 8930209 / Ray Corstin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY II**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/874</th>
<th>Respondent: 8930209 / Ray Corstin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I note that the local road strategy allows for 30 electric car charging points, but I would suggest that this is likely to be an underestimate in the coming 20 years, given the rapid increase in acceptance and adoption of electric/hybrid cars in recent years.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17705</th>
<th>Respondent: 8930305 / Elaine Best</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy I1: Infrastructure and Delivery as very little consideration appears to have been given to this essential element and no detail of how such significant housing developments will be supported and sustained should they proceed. No account appears to have been taken of the degree of flooding that occurs.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5454</th>
<th>Respondent: 8930465 / Michael &amp; Carol Cook</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the traffic congestion any additional development will cause to our local villages due to inadequate road infrastructure. The A3 is at a standstill daily heading north to London and south at Stag Hill and that is without any additional development within the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5468</th>
<th>Respondent: 8930465 / Michael &amp; Carol Cook</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object most strongly to the traffic congestion any additional development will cause to our local villages due to inadequate road infrastructure. As it is now, whenever there is a traffic accident on the A3 or M25, vehicles try to cut through all the local roads (at speed quite often) which results in major congestion and danger through all the small villages in the area. The A3 is at a standstill daily heading north to London and south at Stag Hill and that is without any additional development within the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/2674</th>
<th>Respondent: 8931105 / Elizabeth Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure: as residents know only too well, the infrastructure of the Horsleys is already sorely inadequate and could emphatically not support any further increase in households and residents. Drains, water supply, medical facilities and roads are already overstretched and could not possibly cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes would lead to flood risk here and downstream along the Wey and Thames.

Drainage and sewerage: the sewerage system is already inadequate as many will testify. To give just one instance, and there are many, after heavy rain (and not "exceptional rain") the main sewer running parallel to Ockham Road overflows and a manhole cover in a field in Slade Farm is displaced, depositing raw sewage in the field and adjacent ditch. The area around the site off Green Lane is a major flood risk, with raw sewage pouring into the roads, on the occasion of the last major flood at Christmas 2013.

Schools: the single school in West Horsley is already very much over-subscribed, with further development meaning even more existing residents' children would not be eligible. The knock-on effect of the proposed development would be greatly increased traffic on local roads for school runs to outlying schools.

Medical centre: the single medical centre shared between the Horsleys is similarly over-subscribed and resources and staff overstretched. Such a significant increase in population as proposed would stretch this to breaking point.

Parking: parking spaces near the shops of the Horsleys are very limited, as they are at the station. The impact of such a disproportionate increase in population as proposed would overstretch these facilities even further, make it difficult if not impossible for many residents, including those older and infirm who depend on them, to go to the shops, medical centre and chemist.
Flooding: the land between Silkmore Lane and Ripley Lane is rated as low flood risk however those familiar with the area know that there is such severe flooding in Ripley Lane that it is completely impassable several times a year. There is also frequent severe flooding after heavy rain on The Street, East Lane, and Long Reach, so much so that they are impassable to anything other than a 4x4. The run-off inevitable from further development would exacerbate this.

Wildlife: no consideration has been shown of the potential impact of the proposed development on wildlife in the Horsleys. There would inevitably be loss of habitat, and disturbance caused by such an increase in residents and households and concomitant traffic.

‘National planning policy does however ask us to take opportunities to enhance wildlife through our Local Plan.’ you say, yet there have apparently not even been any wildlife impact assessments.

I urge the council to withdraw this plan and to consult with residents to develop a sustainable plan of proportionate development which should not damage existing settlements

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14429  Respondent: 8938881 / Ann Cook  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Sewage and water provision risks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1640  Respondent: 8934657 / Nigel Watson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The desirable character of most of the villages in Guildford Borough, such as East and West Horsley, very much depends on their remaining at or close to their present size and not being overwhelmed by new housing estates. Local facilities in our villages that are already fully stretched include roads, schools, water and sewerage, shops, medical services, and associated car parking spaces. These constraints mean there is no room for any significant increase in population in our villages.

Ultimately (and I recognise this is outside the remit of Guildford Borough - but it needs to be taken into account in assessing whether the Borough’s proposals make any sense), it would be crazy to either allow the UK population to expand indefinitely at anything the current rate; or to encourage incomers to settle anywhere in the overcrowded South-East region (other than perhaps in inner London, and a few other town centres). The region has very limited natural resources (in particular drinking water, in the droughts that are an increasing risk from climate change). This and other infrastructure constraints make it imperative to spread the burden into other parts of the UK, where there is also better scope for more housing and a much higher need for an invigorated local economy.

At the present moment much of the South-East is still, despite all the pressures, a reasonably good place to live. But it will lose its remaining attractions if more and more people are crammed in.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policies 11,12,13 INFRASTRUCTURE

GBC’s rampant expansionist policy will be building on a crumbling infrastructure! The goal of ‘sustainability’ is very unlikely to be achieved. GBC’s plans for our infrastructure seem to rely on others.

THE ROADS & PAVEMENTS

NOW driving and cycling on our local roads is an unpleasant experience. At present most people in this area wish to travel north/south. However most of our main roads (A246, A25, A31) go east/west! The roads going north/south are generally totally unsuited to carry the current amount of traffic especially with the enormous lorries. In Horsley we have a prime example of this problem. Ockham Road South and Ockham Road North are frequently in gridlock; these roads are narrow, pot-holed with several pinch points. Short of knocking down a vast number of large houses (most worth over a million pounds) there is limited scope for improvements!

The pavements are very narrow and uneven. Pedestrians have an unpleasant and hazardous trip with many lorries mounting the pavement. NOW it is an unpleasant walk to the station or the shops. It is particularly unpleasant for people with prams, pushchairs and wheel chairs. One is very concerned for children walking along these paths.

SCHOOLS

NOW we do not have sufficient school places to meet local needs. Children often have to be given places miles away in Dorking or Woking.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

NOW the medical services are struggling to cope with demand.

Generally I am very concerned about the infrastructure in the area as it is already over stretched and scope for improvement is very limited.

I would urge that any assessment of the current situation is not done in school holidays or main holiday times. It is important to do this work at prime times of the day and the year!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17122  
Respondent: 8940225 / Glen Ruddy  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy 11)

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the lack of concrete and properly thought-through proposals in relation to infrastructure. The current infrastructure is struggling now, and there would be substantial increase in pressure on local schools (th., Raleigh School and Howard of Effingham are both oversubscribed and full), medical surgeries, roads, parking provision and drainage. Whilst limited additional provision of certain aspects of the infrastructure is suggested within the proposals, there remain significant problems, for example, in relation to increased road traffic (including for leisure use such as cycling, already a real problem in the area at weekends) and parking, that will mean local residents and businesses are put to considerable inconvenience. This in turn is likely to result in some local businesses foundering due to difficulties with access.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16022  Respondent: 8941761 / FLGCA (Paul Kassell)  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2.5 Infrastructure

New developments will pay a levy to ensure impact on infrastructure will be mitigated, but this levy cannot be used to improve the current situation. Traffic in and around Guildford is problematic as the normal situation. Efforts to persuade residents to walk, cycle or use public transport have met with limited success.

Surrey County Council has estimated a shortfall of £3 billion to provide the infrastructure required to support projected housebuilding in the area and admit: “We cannot ask our residents to fund something that is completely out of the reach of the council taxpayer”.

With the majority of new developments outside Guildford town centre, the plan will generate more journeys to put additional strain on an already malfunctioning infrastructure.

3.4 Infrastructure

The growth in the vision is predicated on the delivery of the necessary infrastructure, yet the infrastructure schedule is light on detail and vague on costs. There is little action in the west of Guildford in particular to alleviate the poor rush hour experience of drivers along the arterial routes into Guildford (A320, A322 and A323). Any action improving egress from the A3 and A31 will lead to increased congestion on these routes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: IMAGE 1.png (202 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16058  Respondent: 8941761 / FLGCA (Paul Kassell)  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Whilst we support the sentiment that “infrastructure needed to support development should be provided and available when first needed to serve the occupants and users of the development” this ignores the fact that current infrastructure is not sufficient to support the existing population.
Below is a representation of Guildford traffic averages at 8:30 am on a Monday morning. Roads are coloured green and overlaid with red if congestion is taking place (courtesy of Google Maps).

Appendix C is very short on detail and for the Aldershot Road in Guildford – already severely impacted in the peak morning hour, there is no respite. The projected developments at Ash and Flexford will add further traffic to the route from Fairlands to Guildford.

In terms of monitoring, the measure of CIL receipts and spending is completely ineffective and unlikely to measure the satisfaction of residents. A much better measure would be average speeds during rush hour on the arterial routes through Guildford.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17592</th>
<th>Respondent: 8944737 / Martin Grant Homes (Martin Grant Homes)</th>
<th>Agent: Barton Willmore (Michael Knott)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 In advance of GBC published a draft CIL Charging Schedule and a clearer understanding of the approach to be taken in relation to strategic sites including Gosden Hill, MGH reserves its position regarding Policy I1. We comment separately on the Infrastructure Schedule set out at Appendix C of the Local Plan and the requirements expressed in Policy A25 relating to Gosden Hill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17231</th>
<th>Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the fact that local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed by large numbers of additional residents – it is already difficult to get an appointment at the GP and the RSCH is failing to meet waiting times for outpatients’ appointments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the impact of large numbers of additional residents on local policing facilities which will be further overwhelmed. Surrey Police are currently unable to cope with dealing with local residents’ concerns [eg breach of law on PROWs on allocation A35] citing lack of resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the impact of large numbers of new residents on school places which has not been properly planned. For example, Send Primary School (in the process of being rebuilt) is being rebuilt with no spare capacity. The proposed redevelopment of the Raleigh School in Horsley [not even in the local plan] is only for redevelopment not for enlargement. Schools planned for Three Farms Meadows will not be operational for the first 500 houses of development. Where will those children go to school? There is no capacity. When the school is built at A35 children will have to be bussed in from elsewhere as it’s not possible to walk… adding to congestion on local roads and the Strategic Road Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2737  Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

26. In Guildford borough, it is widely accepted that there is an infrastructure deficit particularly in roads and the provision of health services. The needs of current residents are not taken into account in policy ID1. All infrastructure should be in place before development of strategic sites takes place to ensure that the developer pays so as not to jeopardise the needs of current residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2801  Respondent: 8945793 / Helen Bell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no infrastructure in place for such excessive building. The roads, schools, doctors' surgeries, etc, are at breaking point at the moment. Wood Street Village and Worplesdon in general have a great problem with flooding. Proposing to vastly increase the villages to such an extent will only add to urban sprawl and exacerbate the problems that already exist. At peak times Guildford comes to a halt with most roads being blocked by the vast amount of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9384  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy 11: Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT. The infrastructure needs to be considered now, not left until planning applications for sites are received. By that time there will be a presumption in favour of development on sites included in the plan.

The Strategic Highways Assessment is not fit for purpose and should be removed from the evidence. Its methodologies grossly underestimate current traffic levels and therefore the impact of further development.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16147</th>
<th>Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It would be impossible to provide adequate infrastructure to support this level of housing development without losing even more of the Green Belt, widening roads and enlarging junctions, and ruining the rural nature of the borough’s villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16172</th>
<th>Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the insetting of villages.

I OBJECT to the presumption in favour of development in inset villages. The wording of the remainder of the policy is too imprecise to guard against inappropriate development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/2526</th>
<th>Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy ID1: Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT since the changes have not addressed my concerns. The infrastructure needs to be considered now, not left until planning applications for sites are received.

The Strategic Highways Assessment is not fit for purpose. Its methodologies grossly underestimate current traffic levels and therefore the impact of further development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. Lack of Adequate Infrastructure Plans

By your own admission your infrastructure plans are incomplete and subject to uncertainty as to timing and availability of money for infrastructure investment. Consequently many of your developments proposed in the LAA fail to meet the basic principle of sustainable development enshrined in policy S1, and should be withdrawn for that reason. For instance, you are proposing an increase of up to 623 new dwellings in the Horsleys (an increase of over 30%) without any corresponding increase identifiable in your Plan in local primary school capacity (the existing schools already being oversubscribed). Similarly, no corresponding improvements are proposed to local road capacity or local public transport.

In the same vein, you designate the former Wisley airfield as a site for intensive residential development without any assurance that the necessary infrastructure improvements will be in place before the site is occupied. Your IDP admits, for example, that new schools are only likely to be made available after residential developments have been largely completed; this would therefore impose worsened education provision on existing residents as well. Similar considerations apply at Wisley to medical provision, public transport, roads and access, and flood prevention and drainage; there is no guarantee when, if indeed ever, that any of the required infrastructure improvements will be made.

The lack of adequate infrastructure plans therefore makes a mockery of your claim that the developments in the Local Plan are sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
All ready we suffer from over crowding, too many cars and pressure on our over subscribed surgeries, hospitals and schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8049</th>
<th>Respondent: 8954529 / Maggi Moss</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford infrastructure needs to be drastically improved regardless of any future expansion. Existing major transport issues must be resolved before any further expansion is implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/381</th>
<th>Respondent: 8956481 / A J Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the failure of Policy D1 properly to address the issue and in particular the inadequacy of the Guildford Borough Council Transport Strategy 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>The present infrastructure is inadequate to meet current requirements for transport, medical care, education, flood control and water supply. Developments proposed by the plan would overwhelm these and Policy D1 makes no realistic proposal to deal with the problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6469</th>
<th>Respondent: 8957409 / Horsley Countryside Preservation Society (Roy Proctor)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure
We strongly support the need for improvement in the infrastructure of East and West Horsley. However, the GBPSLP is focused on the Infrastructure required to support potential future development. This ignores the fact that the current infrastructure is not functioning in an acceptable manner.

The Infrastructure in the Horsleys is not only failing to meet the current needs of users but some aspects, such as roads, have no obvious possibility for improvement. The boundaries of the 82039, which runs through East Horsley, are such that widening is not possible. The number, vehicle size and speed of the current traffic using this road is already far greater than the original design could have envisaged. The inability of the roads, drainage, schools and medical facilities to adequately support the existing homes within East and West Horsley is evident, and has been acknowledged at Borough and County level. We do not believe that Community Infrastructure Levy is intended or designed to deal with these existing constraints. **We therefore object** to the development proposals in the Horsleys on the grounds that infrastructure constraints have not been applied, and no data has been produced to demonstrate how the existing issues can be dealt with.

In addition, the impact of the proposed 2,000 houses at Ockham on the site of the former Wisley airfield would have a dramatic affect on the roads, station parking and rail transport overloading for residents of East and West Horsley. It would also create a settlement of questionable sustainability besides removing an environmentally sensitive and strategically placed tract of land from the Green Belt. We therefore **object** to the identification of this as a strategic development site and request its removal from the plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/1193  **Respondent:** 8957409 / Horsley Countryside Preservation Society (Roy Proctor)
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

*Policy ID1*

We object to the policy on Infrastructure and delivery.

Comments regarding the current overloading of all aspects of infrastructure were made during previous consultations. There is no reason to believe that there will be any improvement in delivery of infrastructure capability in the future and it is obvious that the only additional infrastructure being considered is that required for new development. That means that the current infrastructure deficit will continue throughout the plan period. It also means that current underperformance will be accentuated by the addition of new developments and, particularly for road transport aspects of infrastructure, the disruption resulting from development works will exacerbate the current situation.

The sustainability of development in West Horsley is particularly questionable and the evidence of this is apparent from its position in the settlement hierarchy table produced by GBC (Appx.XII)

In conclusion, we object to the way in which the distribution of proposed new housing across the borough has changed from 2016 to 2017 as it increases the pressure on the Metropolitan Green Belt in the area of the borough which is most sensitive to loss.

For the Guildford area and for Ash and Tongham the proportion of homes is roughly the same from 2016 to 2017. Housing allocation for the Western rural area of the borough has reduced by 25% and the Eastern area has increased by 14%. Thus, of the total house allocation for the borough during the plan period, 48% is planned to be built in the Eastern rural areas. This inevitably means that more Green Belt land will be utilised and the indication is that around 58% of all the new development in the borough will be built on Green Belt land. This does not accord with statements that the Green Belt will be protected, nor that a "brown field first" policy will be implemented.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2545  Respondent: 8958369 / B.P. Austin  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure

13.1 object to policy 11 on infrastructure as inadequate. The proposed new housing will pose a burden on an infrastructure already seriously stretched. Quite apart from the pressures on schools, medical facilities, roads and parking the lack of capacity in the basic utilities of electricity, water and sewage are not adequately addressed with no clear plan for where adequate funding for the major investment needed will come from. It looks piecemeal, not planned.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17311  Respondent: 8967233 / University of Surrey (University of Surrey)  Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Luke Vallins)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The University broadly supports this policy. The University recognises the importance of delivering new infrastructure to support major new development in the borough, the need to make best use of existing infrastructure, and the potential opportunities for improvement of this infrastructure.

The University notes the infrastructure requirements identified in relation to Blackwell Farm in Appendix C.

The introduction of CIL is noted and supported provided this sets appropriate chargeable rates taking account of viability and the extent to which new infrastructure is provided by the developer as an integral part of the scheme proposals.

Further comments are made in relation to policy I2 below.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16062  Respondent: 8968001 / M & G Real Estate  Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Tim Hancock)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
M&G supports Strategic Objective 11 under Economy which is stated as: “11. Reinforce Guildford’s role as Surrey County’s premier town centre destination whilst protecting and enhancing its cultural facilities and heritage assets.”

However, Guildford’s future prosperity and success as a primary shopping centre should not be taken for granted. The Council’s evidence base document the Retail and Leisure Study 2015 provides a useful context: “1.4 By way of context, although Guildford town centre serves an important role as the largest centre in terms of retail floorspace in Surrey, it is facing strong competition from neighbouring centres where significant new retail and leisure developments are in the pipeline (Section 4).”

M&G recommends that the Plan should acknowledge the competitive nature of retail and recognise the need to make optimum use of the North Street site which is being proposed as the major opportunity to meet this objective (11). There is capacity to facilitate a greater quantum of food and drink and residential and higher density of development than currently allowed for in policy A6. The draft plan should therefore be amended to provide for this additional capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16069  Respondent: 8968001 / M & G Real Estate  Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Tim Hancock)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3.21 M&G objects to this policy as currently worded as it states that CIL will be collected from “most new build developments”. In view of the commercial challenges and complexities of the North Street site, M&G proposes that proposals outlined for North Street in Policy A2 should be CIL exempt in favour of a bespoke S106 agreement.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7306  Respondent: 8971233 / Tim J. Harrold  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Infrastructure

CPRE objects at the failure to supply a satisfactory infrastructure strategy or delivery plan for Guildford in time for this consultation. In the Surrey Infrastructure Study of January 2016 the total infrastructure cost required was assessed to reach £1.162 billion. The total secured funding was given as £75.8 million and the total expected funding was estimated at £568.2 million. This left a funding gap of £518 million which is equivalent to 55% of the total costs budget. CPRE OBJECTION.

CPRE recognises that many major infrastructure decisions affecting Guildford District are outside the control of GBC and that this makes planning ahead for a long period almost impossible, especially at a time when the economic outlook is so uncertain and difficult to predict. Many decisions which can only be outlined as aspirations depend on infrastructure provision being agreed by Highways England (M25 and A3), Historic England, Natural England, Network Rail, the Surrey County Council, and Thames Water. The constraint of providing SANGS in connection with the Thames Basin Heaths has also to be taken into account.
GBC are making ambitious proposals for housing regardless of the lack of adequate infrastructure in support. Without this being provided before development is begun, there will we believe be a real threat of intensified disruption caused by traffic congestion, particularly at peak times, in many communities. CPRE OBJECTION.

Surrey’s motorways already carry 80% more traffic than the average for the South East and our A roads 66% more than the national average. CPRE has been heavily concerned with traffic management issues across the county for many years. We have served on the M25 Orbit Committee and were involved with the consultation on the Hindhead tunnel, the Cobham Motorway Service Area and the Hard Shoulder Running Initiative for the M25 between Junctions 5 and 7. We have also been concerned for a prolonged period with the various AirTrack rail proposals linking Guildford and Woking to Heathrow which are now in abeyance. We expect to become involved in monitoring the North Downs rail proposal linking Reading to Gatwick via Guildford.

We think it unrealistic for Cross Rail 2 to be discussed at this continuing time of likely austerity as a means of freeing up the overburdened rail link to Waterloo from Guildford and Woking. We do have, however, to recognise the planning challenge that the high percentage of commuters travelling to London for work represents, together with a comparable number coming into both Guildford and Woking for daily employment. It is disheartening to see the inadequacy of the Solum proposal for Guildford’s mainline station which did not sufficiently address the issues that concern commuters or residents most. CPRE OBJECTION.

The detrimental impact of traffic congestion on quality of life across Surrey is a topic of importance to everyone. The location of schools and their school runs are of course a daily cause of traffic problems. The proposal for the Hoe Valley school and its associated Leisure and Sporting facilities will be on Green Belt land and will certainly not improve matters on the A320 at Mayford on the road between Guildford and Woking, even if Paragraph 89 of the NPPF allows for greater flexibility to be shown for outdoor sport and recreation within the Green Belt, as long as it does not conflict with its openness. The Woking Traffic Survey acknowledges that this proposed development will have a damaging effect on congestion on the A320 and A322 as well as on other local roads. CPRE OBJECTION.

Congestion on A roads leads to the overuse of B roads by speeding traffic that exceeds the relevant limits which are invariably not enforced. The B367 from Ripley to Pyrford is an example of this problem. Speed limits for the Pyrford Conservation Area and elsewhere along this road are not observed except where traffic lights or the narrowness of the road itself, as at Newark lane in Ripley, slows traffic down.

Other roads such as the B380 serve as a link between the A324, the A322 and the A320 and all carry excessive traffic for their size. An example of a C road which is already under severe traffic pressure is Salt Box Road which forms the link between the A320 and the A322 as well as funnelling through traffic between the M3 and the A3. Burdenshot and Goose Rye Road are examples of D roads where safety is a major concern as traffic seeks to find a way through to Worplesdon station which is located within Woking Borough, where a new Park and Ride location is proposed. The question has to be asked in this context as to how this proposal can be considered given the Kemishford bridge access problem and the unsuitability of the bridge near the station at Prey Heath Road with its long history of flooding issues.

CPRE gives these examples of busy roads where house building on the scale envisaged for Guildford and Woking will only make traffic matters much worse. Further analysis is required in both boroughs of the impact of the huge housing projects proposed and the positioning of the school and park and ride facilities they envisage. CPRE OBJECTION.

CPRE questions whether all the development envisaged for Guildford can be considered sustainable and deliverable in the time required. Paying for all this investment will be very hard to achieve through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which is one of the motivating forces behind GBC’s attempt to accelerate passage of the draft Local Plan and use as much Green Belt land in the process as they can. CPRE again maintains that this approach is misguided as it places too much emphasis on economic priorities at the expense of environmental policies which have served the community well and need to be supported rather than undermined. CPRE OBJECTION.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Policy ID1 (Infrastructure and Delivery)
Several changes have been made to Policy ID1 following the consultation in June 2016 on the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2016). However we maintain that Policy ID1 should make reference to the tests set out at paragraph 204 of the Framework to ensure that obligations meet the following tests:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. Guildford needs to have a positive outlook towards improving the environment for all of its residents this includes the air quality as well as the development of the borough and its standing within the greater It could be that because of the special circumstances that Guildford finds itself only limited housing can be achieved.
2. There is considerable evidence that car manufacturers are lying about the emissions from vehicles and Guildford should take a stance to address this by applying a levy to the car manufacturers for the pollution that their deception is causing and in so doing improving the environment form the
3. The aspiration for a tunnel under the A3 will remove through traffic from the rush hour crisis but it will not remove the need for residents of Guildford to access and egress the A3, and therefore not assist with the improvement of the traffic
4. The proposals for SANG’s to offset the need for access to Whitmoor Common appear to be misguided at It would be better to reduce the housing density and provide park space and open land within developments hence reducing traffic on already congested roads. Why travel to a SANG when you could walk your dog or cycle around your own estate?
5. Infrastructure improvements should be carried out by the developers before commencing work on any development to demonstrate to the current residents that they are engaging with local community and cognisant of the needs of those All too often the developer is only concerned with delivery and walking away ignoring the issues that they leave behind them. If this approach means that a development is not viable then the point is proven. This approach has been carried out by another local authority successfully and therefore the precedent is already set.

The SHMA exaggerates the number of dwelling that are required in the development. This is referenced by Neville Byran’s letter in the Surrey Advertiser dated 10 June 2016.

Guildford is unfortunately a dormitory town for London and the growth of London should be met by the London Boroughs and not fed out into the surrounding Home Counties.

There appears to be double counting of the University’s requirements plus the growth that the University has experienced in the last few years is expected to continue. With the view that further education courses are becoming more expensive this continued growth is unlikely to happen.
The DCLG Planning Policy for Travellers Sites dated August 2015 should apply in all cases.

I make the following conclusions about the Section 19 Local Plan

1. The SHMA figure needs to be reduced by having constraints applied to
2. The quoted 6% of Green Belt proposed to be developed is misleading, and has been used to justify an election promise that has been ignored.
3. There is no indication of the duty to co-operate with all the surrounding boroughs and statutory authorities.
4. The arbitrary movement of the urban boundary to move sites out of the green belt is a political expediency to reduce the green belt land
5. He plan is unsound.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14020  Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The current infrastructure in Guildford Borough is woefully inadequate, note that every Friday evening and most weekdays the A3 is congested from Burpham to the A31 junction.

Recently there were roadworks on Ladymead which required the closure of one lane, this caused traffic congestion on the A322 back and beyond the Keens Lane roundabout for 6 weeks during the daytime.

• The sewage treatment works are at capacity.
• The Hospital is at capacity, even though it is losing money.
• There is a lack of electricity supply in the area.

We are led to believe that there is a lack of places in senior schools for the current primary school pupils, which is being addressed by the proposal for additional schools at the strategic sites, but this will add to the congestion on the roads.

The public transport system is not being improved, indeed there will be areas within the borough where there will be no buses in the near future, resulting in additional traffic.

Healthcare provision, Doctors, Dentists, Opticians, improvements or extension of the RSCH have not been addressed in the Local Plan.

Infrastructure improvements should be installed before any development works commence; this will have two benefits showing that the developer is aware of the needs of the existing residents and the provision of the upgraded infrastructure for the new residents. The developer will then be seen as being part of the community both existing and new.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14025  Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Support

However the level at which play facilities should be provided needs to be reduced to 10.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14026  Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

II Infrastructure and DeliveryObject

This policy will not deliver the required infrastructure improvements required to support the existing residents and proposed developments within the Local Plan.

Developers need to be encouraged to install infrastructure improvements before developing a site and by so doing demonstrate that they are engaging with the community in a responsible and fair way.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11965  Respondent: 8979265 / Rachel Taylor  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11970  Respondent: 8979265 / Rachel Taylor  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13117  Respondent: 8993121 / Shelagh Yeomans  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT to this policy.

• Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

• The methodology commissioned by the Council to assess traffic and the corresponding roads infrastructure needs is inadequate for the purpose of the Local Plan and identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Under the growth proposed some locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. Even the A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17139  Respondent: 8993793 / Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd.  Agent: The Howard Partnership Trust (Vicky Lochead)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Berkeley Homes has a long-term interest in several plots of land in the village of Effingham and have been working with Howard of Effingham School to develop proposals to deliver a new school and much needed new housing for the area. These plans were supported in the Draft Local Plan (2014) but were refused planning permission by Guildford Borough Council in March 2016 and are expected to be considered at an Inquiry in Spring 2017. Given the requirement for those proposals to demonstrate very special circumstances as a departure from policy, we expect the suitability of those plans to be established through the planning inquiry, rather than the Local Plan. Nevertheless, we have some observations on the Proposed Submission Local Plan, which are set out below.

You will be aware that the Local Plan will be tested by the Inspector against the four tests of soundness (National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 182), namely that it is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with National Policy. We set out below why we are of the view that the Proposed Submission Local Plan does not meet these tests in relation to the Spatial Strategy (Policy S2), Affordable Homes (Policy H2), the Green Belt (Policy P2), and Infrastructure Delivery (Policy I1).

We understand that Howard of Effingham School will be submitting their own representations on education specific issues relating to Policy I1 on infrastructure delivery.

Policy I1 sets out the Council’s proposed approach to infrastructure delivery and cross-refers to Appendix C which is a schedule of infrastructure items. Infrastructure delivery is regarded as a crucial element of Local Plan making by Government and is one of the five strategic policy areas identified by the NPPF (para 156) that Local Plans should cover, namely:

“the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities”.

In our view, Policy I1 takes a narrow view of infrastructure provision without providing a proper reasoned justification for the items identified in Appendix C or their relationship to the overall Spatial Strategy for the Borough. Neither the Proposed Submission Local Plan itself nor the supporting documents provide a proper assessment of the potential approaches to infrastructure provision, particularly on education and, as far as we are aware, there has been no work undertaken to identify the deliverability of this infrastructure compared to the site and housing trajectory. Secondary school allocations, for example, now rely almost entirely on the delivery of large strategic sites, which are to be delivered later in the plan period and then over several years.

We are, therefore, of the view that Policy I1 is neither justified, nor effective.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2743  Respondent: 8993793 / Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd.  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy ID1 sets out the Council's proposed approach to infrastructure delivery.

Neither the Proposed Submission Local Plan itself nor the supporting documents provide a proper assessment of the potential approaches to infrastructure provision, particularly on education and, as far as we are aware, there has been no work undertaken to identify the deliverability of this infrastructure compared to the site and housing trajectory. Secondary school allocations, for example, now rely almost entirely on the delivery of large strategic sites, which are to be delivered later in the plan period and then over several years. We are, therefore, of the view that Policy 101 is neither justified, nor effective.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Please catalogue my objection to developing this area of green belt, outstanding national beauty and area of great landscape value.

I feel that this would be a wholly inappropriate development within the green belt. Primarily because it would be visible from and adjoin protected AONB and area of great landscape value. As soon as that happens the AONB is blighted. The character of the area, totally rural and picturesque, would be significantly harmed.

The local infrastructure could also not cope with it, despite the Highways Agency’s plans to improve the A3 and A31 junction. There is so much traffic along that stretch of the A31 and A3 that when just one thing is altered tremendous tail backs are created. For example this week the Surrey Sports Park diverted traffic slightly, and the queue to get to the hospital, research park, A3 and Park Barn was queued back nearly into town. It also took half an hour to leave Park Barn. This side of Guildford is already unable to cope with the volume of cars on the roads and could not cope with any more.

I also object on the grounds how it will negatively affect the flora, fauna and habitat within the local woodland, common land and farmland. For example there are nesting Skylarks each year in the land proposed to be developed, as well as many other species of animals and flora.

There has also not been a significant study in to how this will affect the areas of Park Barn where there has already been some localised flooding over the years. Currently the fields act as a run off for the Hogs Back, and where these to be developed there is concern about the risk of flooding among residents.

The harm to the local area far outweighs any special circumstances that the local council may deem fit and I urge the planners to reject plans at this site, despite the five year plan for house building.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/5119  Respondent: 9009025 / Peter Elliott  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I would also like to object to the secretive and high-handed way in which the SHMA process has been The annual house building target is more than double what was agreed in 2010, and more than double what could be explained by the population growth figures for Guildford for the last twenty years. Also, unlike last time, no constraints have been applied for infrastructure or environmental factors, with no explanation offered as to why. GBC has repeatedly refused to involve their electorate in discussing this matter, and has steadfastly refused to explain what factors could account for this huge hike in the annual house building target. All we do know is that G.L. Hearn, who did the SHMA, has a vested interest in setting the figure as high as possible, to generate work for their associates at Constructionline. Government guidelines state that the community should be able to feel confident that the SHMA figure is fair and objective. For the reasons given, GBC has failed woefully in this regard.

Furthermore, I object to the fact that the infrastructure has not been properly assessed, and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels. Anyone who knows Guildford will tell you that traffic congestion here is dire, with long stationary queues of traffic on the A31 and A3 a daily occurrence, and the smallest incident can result in total gridlock. How the planning department can propose adding another possible 26,000 cars to the situation beggars belief, even taking account of the modest improvements to the infrastructure proposed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/1367  Respondent: 9009153 / Lindsay Mitchell  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools
2. I object to the lack of any immediate provision for Medical Facilities and Surgeries
3. I object to the allocation of land to the strategic sites of Wisley Airfield and Gosden Hill Farm as development of these sites would have a disproportionate impact on the surrounding villages
4. I object to site A43athe on and off ramp at Clandon as it will increase traffic problems in the villages
5. I object to the A3 road from the M25 to Guildford becoming so congested that it will become a serious health hazard as a result of exhaust fumes from stationary or very slow moving vehicles

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: pslp171/121  Respondent: 9009153 / Lindsay Mitchell  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7971  Respondent: 9009185 / Diana Elliott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of preparation for the infrastructure, which will have to cope with the huge increase in traffic, which will obviously cause massive congestion and air pollution in an already highly congested area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/589  Respondent: 9016897 / D Grover  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policies ID1 & ID2 Infrastructure – My Objections

Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits “…we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC
prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

**Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections**

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/6864  Respondent: 9047265 / Clare Hewlett  Agent:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The draft plan appears to acknowledge that ‘suitable, adequate infrastructure is crucial’ but does not adequately recognise the limitations of the current infrastructure for the current population, much less a rapidly increased number of homes in the first 5 years of the plan.
- See above comments re school places, medical facilities, youth facilities and local parking.
- The local roads, not wide and with narrow and partial pavements, will become even busier, especially at peak times, leading to congestion and pollution. The roads are already in a poor state so additional traffic generated by increases in housing will substantially worsen the situation.
- The existing sewer system, which is already known to be struggling (in the past raw sewage has poured on to the roads around Green Lane in West Horsley during the heavy rains), will be unable to cope if a large number of additional houses is built.
- Some of the sites suggested for housing are at risk of flooding – notably the land at the rear of Ockham Road North. Many pictures have been taken in the past.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9477  Respondent: 9049889 / Patrick Armitage  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the planning based on the visible inability of the local infrastructure to cope with the already increased number of local residents. I catch the train form Horsley station into London daily. Previously there would be room for all passengers on the platform, today there a lot more passengers boarding at Horsley and often no seats available- this is after the platform extension and before any development has started. It is clear that by adding another 500 houses in Horsley and 2000 at Wisley the rail network will NOT be able to service the needs of the local community.

In addition other local amenities of West and East Horsley, car parking, doctors surgery, primary school, sports clubs are full to bursting and cannot maintain with the current level of demand.

The Local Plan makes no reference to providing increased infrastructure to compensate for the extra cars, children and people.

Local roads are narrow and get busy during at school times, many children in the area walk, scooter and cycling to school. Increase the population will cause further congestion and puts children’s lives in danger.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8684  Respondent: 9050337 / Nigel Geary  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the planning based on the visible inability of the local infrastructure to cope with the already increased number of local residents. I catch the train form Horsley station into London daily. Previously there would be room for all passengers on the platform, today there a lot more passengers boarding at Horsley and often no seats available- this is after the platform extension and before any development has started. It is clear that by adding another 500 houses in Horsley and 2000 at Wisley the rail network will NOT be able to service the needs of the local community.

In addition other local amenities of West and East Horsley, car parking, doctors surgery, primary school, sports clubs are full to bursting and cannot maintain with the current level of demand.

The Local Plan makes no reference to providing increased infrastructure to compensate for the extra cars, children and people.

Local roads are narrow and get busy during at school times, many children in the area walk, scooter and cycling to school. Increase the population will cause further congestion and puts children’s lives in danger.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst I support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which gives me cause for concern.

I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it

is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools.

Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, EHPC believes that this needs to be done earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are
today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s.

I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I accordingly object to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I further object to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2911  Respondent: 9056513 / Edmund Crawford  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Education/Employment

The local schools are all oversubscribed and new schools would also have to be built on Green Belt local land to cater for the ever increasing demand caused by the new developments. There are no employment opportunities in the area and the prospects of any in the future are negligible. Thus new residents would also have to commute.

Infrastructure

The roads in the area are typical of Green Belt countryside. They are narrow and consist of many bends and ditches. For a suggestion to provide walkways and cycle paths is laughable as particularly in winter months, these would be dark and dangerous as street lighting is not used in these areas. If introduced there would be a problem of light pollution and would not be in keeping with the rest of the community. The increase in housing would bring potentially 5000 more cars to the area, increasing the problems locally and at the Wisley Interchange M25/A3 also at the A3 Painshill Interchange. These junctions are at a standstill most mornings as early as 6am. Proposals for improvements to these areas are already too late and by the time they are implemented standing traffic would be an all-day occurrence. This will lead to more pollution, that we need our countryside, mainly trees to absorb, as any reduction in the amount of trees would increase the level of noise and pollution.

The resulting increase in housing and residents would further damage our wildlife and eco system with irreversible effects. The local road conditions are poor and dangerous at present with the volumes that we currently have. Sewer problems are ever present and no increase in volume can be catered for. The renewal of these to Ripley would cause major upheaval and create massive problems to local people and wildlife.

There are no industries and only very small scale employers in the area and the likelihood is that this will not change. Thus, all new residents will need to commute to employment. Roads, trains and a poor bus service are already at capacity. The Doctor’s surgery is full, and parking at the local shops and station are also at full capacity. We would require a new Police and Fire Station to the area due to its increasing size. Increased demand would mean that Guildford and Painshill Fire Stations would not be sufficient.

I could write my thoughts endlessly but would like to sum up by saying:

The housing density for this area is wholly inappropriate and damaging to our community. The infrastructure, roads and transport links are poor. Drainage, foul and surface water is unable to cope with more development of this size and
nature. The Plan is not made to deal with local issues and the developers /land owners only have one aim, profit at all cost.

Guildford Borough Council appears to have the same motive. All that they see is more Council Tax revenue and to hell with the consequences. I also note that most of the areas earmarked for development i.e. East & West Horsley do not seem to have any members of Guildford Borough Council living in the area so are being vigorously attacked as they do not want these developments on their doorstep. I have to raise these points as if we let our Green Belt land be developed our future generations will see it as “our fault” and I do not want that legacy. So I urge the Council to reconsider other options and therefore reject the proposals outright.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13804  Respondent: 9061921 / Susan Hills  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to the planned development especially as there is no planned provision for improvement in infrastructure which is already stretched to its limits.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11473  Respondent: 9062913 / Susan Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I1 Infrastructure and delivery

OBJECT Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The Council’s methodology assessing traffic and roads infrastructure needs is inadequate. It identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1871  Respondent: 9062913 / Susan Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY ID1 INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY

A new Transport Topic Paper has been published by GBC. Items 3.16 and 3.17 (page 10) mention Highways England concerns regarding the Strategic Highway Assessment Report 2016 and two letters. These letters can be accessed from the “Get Involved” website by searching for the Highways England response to the consultation. It seems clear that further modelling will be undertaken before the Examination and it also seems unlikely that it will be consulted on. We consider that any further modelling should include more detailed information so that it can be subject to scrutiny by GBC and the public.

The wording of ID1 has been amended to give an impression that provision of adequate infrastructure will be enforced. However, the reality is that GBC will not determine the required infrastructure. It will be determined by Surrey Highways for the local road network and they are required to support development – not put obstacles in the way. If the Strategic Highway Assessment Report is anything to go by, the requirements will be understated or not even recognised. Transport assessments supporting planning applications will be prepared by consultants acting for, and remunerated by, the applicant. Improvements to the strategic road network (e.g. A3) will be determined by Highways England, budget constraints, and ministerial decisions.

Cllr Furniss has stated that the proposed Blackwell Farm development will not depend on A3 widening (in response to a question from Karen Stevens to the Executive Advisory Board meeting held on 20 April). It seems likely that Highways England have felt the need to offer a reality check on the likelihood of major work on the A3, such as widening or a tunnel, in the foreseeable future – apart from improvements to two slip roads.

The policy states that infrastructure will be secured by planning condition and/or planning obligation but this will require enforcement and we doubt the ability and willingness of GBC to overcome developers’ viability arguments. For the permissions that require a longer timescale there could be non-delivery issues if the original developer abandons the project without fulfilling all the conditions and obligations. Item 4.6.8 still indicates that GBC will be prepared to reduce infrastructure requirements by negotiation. I.e. viability for the developer will take precedence over infrastructure.

No change has been made to the monitoring requirement which is based on CIL receipts and spending rather than actual, and timely, delivery of infrastructure.


I object to ASP 3 new A3/A3100/B2215/A247 Burpham-Burnt common all-movements junction, formed by a new connector road linking between new A3/A3100 Burpham junction (SRN4) and the B2215 London Road, in combination with the new A3 northbound on-slip (SRN9) and the new A3 southbound off-slip (SRN10) under Infrastructure and Delivery.

If development gets the go ahead for the strategic site at Gosden Hill it would be logical to construct a 4 way A3 interchange at Burpham. The A247 link road to Woking already at capacity will become gridlocked.

I object to SRN4 New A3/A3100 Burpham junction with relocated A3 southbound off-slip and new A3 southbound on-slip. This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 whereby traffic will be passing directly through Send from the A3 and M25 and the proposed new development at Wisley.
I object to SRN9 A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common) and SRN10 A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common). This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 which is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18564  Respondent: 9079393 / Wisley Property Investments Ltd.  Agent: Savills (Charles Collins)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1: Infrastructure and Delivery

Object (not positively prepared nor effective in respect of NPPF paragraph 182)

WPI supports entirely the provision of phased infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of developments and enable the delivery of the Local Plan. The provision of new hard and soft and Green Infrastructure at the Wisley new settlement is central to the promotion and delivery of the proposed allocation.

The present draft policy wording is ineffective and unjustified, as it seeks infrastructure based solely on when it is first needed by occupants. This is overly narrow and rigid, and pays little attention to wider infrastructure delivery factors. A proportional approach should be included, which enables the phased delivery of infrastructure, commensurate to overall scheme delivery, the overall Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) supporting the Local Plan, and with due regard to scheme viability, and hence delivery. The present wording which requires ‘timely’ infrastructure delivery, pays no attention to development viability, and hence the situation whereby the necessary infrastructure has to be phased alongside development delivery.

Infrastructure provision and delivery will ultimately be the responsibility of a number of organisations, developers and landowners as well as public authorities. Whilst Section 106 and CIL funding is important, subject to the relevant tests of the CIL Regulations (122/123), the Local Plan will only be delivered on the basis of wider funding streams. This is clearly outlined within the Surrey Infrastructure Study (2016) produced by SCC. This outlines:

- Total infrastructure costs for GBC estimated to be £1.16bn
- £75m is secured funding
- Expected funding is as much as £569m
- Which leaves a shortfall of £518m
- Deficits in primary and secondary education
- County wide requirement for further community facilities, doctors (an additional 11 GPs), outdoor sport and recreation and social care beds
- Most of the infrastructure cost is highway and rail, specific for Guildford Borough
- Specific to the Wisley new settlement, the Junction 10 (M25/A3) is costed at £175m, with funding. The proposed Guildford Strategic Corridor (A3) is listed at £300m.

WPI strongly supports the delivery of new infrastructure. In the representation in respect of the proposed allocation of the Wisley new settlement (draft allocation A35), WPI notes that the delivery of the new settlement will meet many of the priorities listed in the Surrey Infrastructure Study. Appendix 5 outlines the education needs for the Wisley new settlement, in support of the requirement for a primary and secondary school on site.
**Comment ID:** pslp171/2758  **Respondent:** 9079393 / Wisley Property Investments Ltd.  **Agent:** Savills (Jim Beavan)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Section / page / para</th>
<th>Original Changes requested (July 2016 Representation)</th>
<th>Understanding of changes shown in the Focused Amendments (June 2017)</th>
<th>WPI Comments (Updated Representation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy I1: Infrastructure and Delivery Page 108</td>
<td>The policy should be amended to include reference to wider funding streams, including Central and Local Government finance, and Local Enterprise Partnership funding. These are relevant infrastructure funding streams, in addition to developer contributions and CIL. The policy should also make clear reference to &quot;the phased delivery of infrastructure to meet identified needs and enable associated wider benefits, in accordance with the CIL Regulations&quot;.</td>
<td>(Pages 122 and 123). The title of the policy has changed to “ID1” and there are considerable changes to the policy text. The requested clarification on means of funding has not been included. Phasing is now mentioned but the specific wording requested is not included.</td>
<td>New policy title and details are noted, notably the reference to phasing. Objection withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5422  **Respondent:** 9081089 / William D Barker OBE  **Agent:**  

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment ID:** pslp171/2758  **Respondent:** 9079393 / Wisley Property Investments Ltd.  **Agent:** Savills (Jim Beavan)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2710  Respondent: 9081089 / William D Barker OBE  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plan which will move public service bus network already considered inadequate for current needs, to one that will be unviable to run at all on account of the congestion the plan as proposed will accrue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7031  Respondent: 9094753 / D Jones  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.
This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14043  Respondent: 9095713 / Melanie Richards  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to the plan because having lived in East Horsley for 15 years, I know that the local infrastructure is overloaded already. Local schools are full, drainage is inadequate and medical services stretched to breaking point.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14567  Respondent: 9096289 / John Cox  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Existing infrastructure is at full capacity and the draft plan does not explain how this will be upgraded and who will pay for it. Developers should be required to find the bulk of the costs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3777  Respondent: 9097409 / Lindsey Fisher  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Doctors

The only Doctors Medical Practice serving all of West and East Horsley and areas beyond, is always very busy and residents have difficulty getting appointments as it is.

Schooling in the area is already full to capacity and in turn producing their own traffic congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17265  Respondent: 9228769 / Cathryn Fleming  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Horsley Infrastructure is Overloaded.

The proposed addition of 593 new houses in the Horsleys excluding the Wisley airfield is not accompanied with a plan to improve the additional infrastructure. The medical facilities are stretched - even to get an emergency appointment right now takes over a week! The primary school is full and there is no secondary school in the Horsleys with children being sent miles away as all the local schools (Howard of Effingham etc are way oversubscribed). It sorely looks like they
assume everyone buying these houses will send their kids to private school and have private GPs, which is absolutely not the case. Roads and parks are overloaded and crowded etc

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12375  Respondent: 9237953 / Patricia Wood  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object that there is no provision for additional doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries to cater for the needs of an increased population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/516  Respondent: 9241793 / Nicky Wilson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clock barn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/175  Respondent: 9245313 / David Murray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Transport
The sites in the eastern part of Ash, that are currently rural, are partly serviced by narrow roads without pavements (Foreman Road and Harpers Road), and unsuitable for pedestrian use. The proposed road schemes in the area are unfunded and undated, so may never happen, and do not address the congestion in the narrow section of Ash Street between the Greyhound and the Coop.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/178  Respondent: 9245313 / David Murray  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Primary education.

You state that 1-2 extra forms of entry will be needed, most likely at Ash Grange school as it is nearest to the bulk if the new development. As FOEs have to be whole numbers, this means turning a 1 FOE school to a 3 FOE school. Has the feasibility and cost of this been seriously considered? What consultations have taken place? Who will pay? This is a matter of some urgency as the classrooms have to be built and staffed before the first children arrive, which will be within the next 3 years. I would also mention potential difficulties with parent parking, already a problem in the area near the school. If instead you added one of the FOEs to the Walsh school, you would have the same issues at that school.

2. NHS General practices.

Your (almost illegible) map of GPs in the borough shows none in the western part of the borough, despite the existence of a large practice in Ash Vale (the only one in the area). Can this practice deal with a 30% increase in patients? Will they use the land offered in the Ash Lodge Drive development? How much will it cost? Who will pay? The Ash Vale practice has poor access, with very limited parking, and is not on a bus route. It is also too far from the proposed new developments for people to walk.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4482  Respondent: 9298465 / Peter Grover  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY II

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8088  Respondent: 9298689 / Rod Wild  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy 11 - Infrastructure and delivery

OBJECT. There is a hopeless mismatch between the housing aspirations and infrastructure. Apart from a few hopes around the A3 junctions, nothing is suggested that might help in any material way. This is true throughout Guildford but particularly in the NW sector. In 2011, Guildford was labelled the 42nd most congested city in Europe. There are already serious problems with the AJ and the local roads, of which the northwest sector with the A320, A322 and A323 is probably the worst. But still there are sites in the plan for this sector. See in particular site A22, Keens Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6589  Respondent: 9299745 / Simon Runton  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object strongly to development of Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley) as stipulated in the Guildford Borough Council Draft plan. The plan states that the proposals will have particular regard to 'the distinctive settlement pattern of the village and the important relationship between the built development and the surrounding landscape'. Over 23% of the Plan’s new housing is proposed in the immediate localities of Ockham, Ripley, Send and the Horsleys (of which 65% is allocated to Former Wisley Airfield (FWA/TFM), an area that at present has only 0.3% of the population of GBC. I don't see how this can be justified as the proposal recommends increasing the number of properties in the West Horsley alone by over 34% without any significant investment in infrastructure to the surrounding areas. For example, both local primary and secondary schools are hugely overcrowded and oversubscribed and want to instigate plans to expand to at least enable them to meet existing demands.

I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and protect the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM. The size and
condition of roads, drainage and supplementary transport links, particularly the train services will not cope with such a huge increase in demand without significant investment.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6724  **Respondent:** 9299745 / Simon Runton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and protect the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM. The size and condition of roads, drainage and supplementary transport links, particularly the train services will not cope with such a huge increase in demand without significant investment.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/20  **Respondent:** 9322113 / John Lillywhite  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

At present the infrastructure cannot cope with the current number of people and vehicles:

- it is impossible to park at East Horsley station
- the trains are standing room only after two stops in the mornings
- it is not possible to get a doctors appointment with the doctor you want on the day you want
- the roads are falling apart
- the local schools are over subscribed
- pollution is toxic around junction 10 on the M25

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8346  **Respondent:** 9323361 / Paul Holden  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our infrastructure in Send, Ripley and Send Marsh and Clandon being already overloaded such that the smallest disruptions cause gridlock over much of our essentially rural roads network please also note that:

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14962  Respondent: 9327009 / sp2 Consulting Limited (Stephen Parker)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT. Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield. The Council’s methodology assessing traffic and roads infrastructure needs is inadequate. It identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10751  Respondent: 9334785 / Carol Cook  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object most strongly to the traffic congestion any additional development will cause to our local villages due to inadequate road infrastructure (Policy11). As it is now, whenever there is a traffic accident on the A3 or M25, vehicles try to cut through all the local roads (at speed quite often) which results in major congestion and danger through all the small villages in the area. The A3 is at a standstill daily heading north to London and south at Stag Hill and that is without any additional development within the area.

I object to the developments proposed at Garlick’s Arch, Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Clandon Golf Course I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for those sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy I1: Infrastructure and Delivery

On reading this policy it sounds OK. But, the reality of this Local Plan is that despite its statement that “infrastructure needed to support development should be provided and available when first needed to serve the occupants and users of the development” many of the proposed developments will not in fact deliver infrastructure at the time that it is needed. Schools, medical facilities, road improvements, parking etc. are all likely to be delivered (if at all) well after they are first needed. Agreements can be made with developers that, for example, a school will be available for use after 500 dwellings have been built. Under those circumstances, it is not uncommon that the houses are built in phases, and – by an amazing coincidence – there is a pause after 499 houses have been completed.

The only way to know in advance how infrastructure delivery is going to pan out is to have a genuinely detailed plan for infrastructure that covers specifications, binding costs and timescales. Anything less is a recipe for disaster, and unfortunately the Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C of the Plan falls well short of this requirement. **I therefore OBJECT** to this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

OBJECT (on 2 distinct grounds)

1. Paragraph 5 of this Policy states that “When determining planning applications, and attaching appropriate planning conditions and/or planning obligations, regard will be had to the delivery and timing of delivery of the key infrastructure, or otherwise alternative interventions which provide comparable mitigation”. There are two fundamental points here:

   a) “Key infrastructure” is exactly that – it is “key” ie. essential. Residents don’t want planners to “have regard for” the delivery and timing of such infrastructure; instead they want a genuine guarantee that infrastructure will be in place when it is required, and not a day later.

   b) Because “key infrastructure” is essential (by definition), its absence cannot be “mitigated by alternative interventions”.

This paragraph seriously weakens the provisions of paragraph 2 of the Policy, and it needs to be deleted. Any form of words that hints that there could be an acceptable formula for delaying the delivery of infrastructure will simply be an open invitation for developers to pursue exactly that goal. **I object to this Policy on the grounds that it is simply aspirational and is too weak to withstand challenge at Planning Appeals.**

1. As a separate point, Appendix C to the draft Local Plan lists a series of infrastructure projects with a total cost of well in excess of £1 billion, whose joint effects would have a very significant impact on a large proportion of the borough’s residents. In addition, there will inevitably be very considerable interactions between the various individual projects, and with most if not all of the major development projects that are proposed. These interactions will arise both from the “static” physical influences of one upon another, and in the relative timings...
of the various projects. Moreover, the timescale (and even potentially the very existence) of many of the more significant projects is outside the control of Guildford Borough Council. Overall, this collection of infrastructure projects needs to be planned and phased very carefully indeed. In short, there needs to be an infrastructure masterplan which is formally agreed between the various contributors. Otherwise instead of being a well-constructed programme of inter-related improvements, the required infrastructure developments will depend more on an “it’ll be alright on the night” approach – which would lead to painful long term chaos for residents. The Plan presents no evidence from which to draw confidence that an adequate level of planning has taken place; even the introductory remarks in Appendix C state that it “is not an exhaustive list of all the infrastructure that will be provided or improved in the borough during the plan period”. Moreover, I have not even been able to find a simple map that presents in one place a basic layout of the various projects from which one could readily infer at least some of the likely interactions between them. I object to this Policy on the grounds that a great deal of work remains to be done before borough residents can even consider the overall proposals before them in a rational way. A properly considered, detailed infrastructure masterplan (including phasings, formal commitments by the contributors, and a proper examination of the impacts of any changes in the relative schedules) will be essential before even considering embarking on an “adventure” such as this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

9. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure.

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Crandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6353   Respondent: 9607905 / Anne Pascoe   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all. Despite the Garlick's Archsite (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/791   Respondent: 10281569 / Alison Sutherland   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The infrastructure in the area is unable to support a development on the site: Keens Lane is only 4.4m wide at the junction of Sime Close and Timbers (the 16th century property on the north side of the road). The roundabout at the eastern end of Keens Lane is dangerous because of traffic from Guildford treating it as a chicane. Worplesdon Road is currently one of the worst roads in the area for traffic congestion during rush hours. Any hardstanding from a development west of Findlay Drive will increase the already significant run off into Sime Close which floods the side of Syndey Court every time it rains, and consequentially silting up of the soakaway.

I understand Gravetts Lane was flooded on 23rd June after the rain the night before and the sewers were bubbling up with the need for a major clean up to be carried out. There is insufficient infrastructure and power which would require a huge upgrade for both gas and electricity in the area. Additionally core services such as Schools, Drs, Hospitals etc - already desperately overstretched - would need to be majorly invested in.

I hope my concerns may be taken into account.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14855  **Respondent:** 10305921 / Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnersh (Kathy Slack)

**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Transport
The Local Plan rightly highlights the pivotal role the provision of transport infrastructure will have to play in the successful delivery of the policies contained within it. Transport issues act as a major constraint, holding back Guildford’s ability to maintain and build its existing economy, which in turn can deter further investment. In particular excessive congestion and poor accessibility to the town centre and key employment sites such as the Surrey Research Park act as a constraint on growth. The Local Plan represents a key opportunity to formulate a coherent plan to ensure that growth can be delivered and sustained across Guildford. It needs to be flexible enough to enable the strategically focused programmes developed by key stakeholders such as the LEP, Surrey County Council, Highways England, Network Rail and the University of Surrey to create accessibility and infrastructure improvements, which will unlock development opportunities, increase housing supply and improve the capacity of Guildford to generate wealth and high quality jobs. Enterprise M3 therefore welcomes the Strategic Objective 12 to facilitate the timely provision of necessary infrastructure to support sustainable development, together with the commitment given through Policy I1 towards the delivery of infrastructure. This commitment demonstrates the importance of working with partners to ensure a programme of infrastructure provision for the Borough is delivered both within and beyond the Plan period.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
3. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2298  Respondent: 10423265 / Jillian Tallick  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16460  Respondent: 10441057 / Guy Kelly  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to object most strongly to the proposals to build on Guildford’s greenbelt land. Past Governments made the policy of greenbelt to protect it for the country, the people and the wildlife and for new Governments to erase these policies makes the making of any policy a farce if, in time, it can be overwritten.

Building new homes is treating the symptoms of over population. All it will bring about is more population and more housing needs. The causes need to be treated, the Government and local authorities should be addressing the causes of over population, not eternally accommodating it. The infrastructure of Guildford cannot take any more population. The Aldershot road is always heavily congested in the morning and evening, the A322 around the Brookwood area is regularly congested and more housing in Guildford would add to this problem, the same for Burpham, Jacobs Well etc. Concreting over the land creates more flooding, with all the rain this summer the flooding is more than evident.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We write again, as we did in 2014, to protest strongly against the new Local Plan and the effect it will have on East and West Horsley. We came to this locality ten years ago, having lived in Guildford for over 30 years, with the hope of spending our retirement in a village community and in an area guarded by green-belt legislation.

This new Local Plan is, once again, an attack on the green belt, in that much of the area is now being changed as a result of a new “village boundary”. The large number of new houses planned for our two villages will have a huge adverse effect on the present community and the balance we now have of shops, schools and light industry. Our narrow road system already suffers from too much traffic, and the dangers will be heightened.

This Local Plan, ill-judged like its predecessor, and published despite strong local opposition, gives the impression of an act of planning vandalism against a semi-rural part of the Borough. What more do people have to do to voice their dissent?

It is evident that if the development of the Wisley airfield proceeds, all we say will be exacerbated greatly. We strongly object to that too.

Surely the Borough has a duty to protect its inhabitants, having regard to where they now live and the manner of living they now enjoy. Your Plan takes no account of that. Please will you listen to our objections.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object.

If you want to build more houses then you should improve the infrastructure first i.e. road, public transport, the hospital, the university, schools, amenities, more doctors surgeries, more NHS dentists etc. and build affordable houses please.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
If you want to build more houses then you should improve the infrastructure first i.e. road, public transport, the hospital, the university, schools, amenities, more doctors surgeries, more NHS dentists etc. and build affordable houses please.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/897  Respondent: 10565569 / Sheila Mardle  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO THE VERY REAL LACK OF PROVISION FOR NEW SCHOOLS AND DOCTORS SURGERIES.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6537  Respondent: 10568769 / Steve Trowbridge  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Secondly I believe that the level of development proposed for the Horsleys will place already stretched local infrastructure under even greater pressure. I myself live in East Horsley and have been unable to get my children into the only primary school within the village. I was also unable to park at Horsley station last week as the car park was already full by 9.30am. This suggests that the local area does not have the vital infrastructure to support such a level of development, and has limited scope for expansion.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6829  Respondent: 10570049 / Jenny Peachey  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4684  Respondent: 10580385 / Brenda Aldred  Agent:
6. INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES

Policies I1, I2 & I3

I consider that there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the proposed housing policy will exacerbate this problem.

1. Roads in the East Horsley Parish are mostly lanes in poor condition with many narrow and winding with pinch points, this, along with poor pavements and lack of streetlighting makes the roads unsuitable for more traffic that increased housing will bring.
2. The schools are oversubscribed.
3. The Medical Centre at full
4. Although it is stated that the maintenance of adequate infrastructure to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider this is not always clear who that is - developers, local councils or utility providers. There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools. Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 - 15 of the Plan.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue and no proposals are made in the Draft Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley's.

I therefore OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals as they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments within the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan appears to focus on committing to an unsustainable increase in housing, while largely ignoring making the magnitude of commitments required for Sustainable Development. Unlike housing, where there is direct revenue from selling the property, infrastructure projects are notoriously hard to fund and usually take a long time to deliver.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7100  Respondent: 10615137 / Nav Nair  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am not anti-development. I support the evolutionary infrastructure changes, such as site A41 allowing the relocation and expansion of the Raleigh School, which would come with increased housing. I support the equivalent in Effingham for the Howard School. Overall, I would also support more radical developments, such as the Wisley site for 2000 homes on a brownfield site. However, only if this comes with a binding commitment to infrastructure development, not just for the site, but for the surrounding areas – such as increased rail and bus services to allow the volume of people into commute. I suspect it will extend urban London out beyond the M25 and catalyse detrimental changes in the future, but it is probably the lesser evil to changing multiple villages around the green belt.

I appeal to the planning team to reconsider the approach, adjusting the increase in housing to where the impact is lessened (probably with lowest net infrastructure development cost), or to put a blanket percentage increase on all areas (which will probably come at a higher net infrastructure development cost).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/639  Respondent: 10616225 / Gloria Shoesmith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. Whilst promising schools to be built accordingly I fear the possibility of approx. 20,000 new pupils even the proposed new schools will not manage.

4. The local surgeries are full to bursting with patients now, along with hospital beds. How can this problem warrant the proposed figure of new dwellings?

5. The small country roads in and around the villages are in a state of poor repair. I have read the proposals and there seems inadequate provision for the likely hood of 40,000 more vehicles traveling these small rural lanes. The current infrastructure will not cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/232  Respondent: 10616321 / Petrina Jeffreson  Agent:
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

6) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and a further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/572</th>
<th>Respondent: 10617601 / G Rabin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>We have already had a number of re-developments in Ripley so these plans for extra housing is disproportionate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are not enough places at local schools now. The doctors are barely coping. It takes 2/3 weeks to get an appointment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/80</th>
<th>Respondent: 10617601 / G Rabin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I object due to the congestion that this development will cause to the local village roads and lack of road infrastructure. There is too much traffic through local villages already. The rural roads are narrow and many have no footpaths. 5,000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic. Air pollution will be also be a big problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9103  Respondent: 10619137 / J. M. Holgate  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The infrastructure is already overloaded
The schools are full to bursting
The medical centre is already overstretched

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12673  Respondent: 10619169 / Wendy Critchlow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Guildford Road (from Bailes Lane to Saint Mark's Church) has become saturated with traffic as a result of the lack of effective road planning around Guildford.

Three accidents have taken place in the vicinity of the church this year— including one fatality.

The existing primary school causes serious traffic congestion as a result of a broad catchment area.

The access and parking to Wanborough station is currently lacking in investment.

Hence the proposal to develop a secondary school requires significant transport infrastructure to support parents, children and residents. Exposing more children to transport and environmental risks would be folly of a high order. I OBJECT to the Local Plan on this point.

Consequently I urge the Council to withdraw this foolish and inadequate plan for Normandy. The consultation has highlighted the need for essential investment in the local transport infrastructure. This investment is already overdue and increases in transport demand should be factored into any future considerations. This inevitable is a precursor of a major housing development that will destroy the village I love.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11136  Respondent: 10633761 / Guida Esteves  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity. There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 485+ houses in planned for Send. The Village Medical Centre is Send is the service for Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley. The impact of the proposed growth cannot be understated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/290  Respondent: 10638241 / Irene M Bleach  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO THE LACK OF IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR NEW SCHOOLS
I OBJECT TO THE LACK OF EVIDENCE OF ANY IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR DOCTORS SURGERIES

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3346  Respondent: 10638241 / Irene M Bleach  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The infrastructure in Horsley is still based on the needs of a small village; the roads/lanes are too narrow, the parking is limited and the extra cars created by the occupants of 593 houses + the 2000 at Wisley will resort in gridlock (they will all commute, there is little business in Horsley)

Drainage/sewerage system is antiquated and cannot cope with the current demands; when it rains water flows down from the A246 through the Horsleys all the way down to the A3 roundabout. If it rains heavily it floods and is impassable; 2500 extra houses with all the water running off the concrete surfaces will require major infrastructure development to cope with it.

There is one primary school in Horsley, a stretched medical centre, no NHS dentist, the shopping facilities are mainly met by a small Budgens convenience shop - who will develop these facilities (on what land) to meet the demands of the new homeowners?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. School:

My understanding is that the proposal to virtually double the size of Normandy is the need for a school in west Guildford. Keith Witham has researched all schools in the area and every one is undersubscribed, Kings Manor by as much as 57%. The birth rate in the area has decreased over the past 3 years or so and I fail to see the need for another school when the present schools are not at capacity.

1. Amenities:

Whilst I acknowledge we have a Church, a Doctors’ Surgery and a railway station, that is about the limit of useful amenities in the area. It can take 3 weeks for a non urgent appointment at the Surgery! What is it going to be like with a population double the size? The railway station car park is extremely limited in parking spaces, not actually counted but my guess is a maximum of 10. Cannot see how this can be enlarged with the car park being surrounded with houses and businesses.

I do understand that there is a need for more housing in the area and personally I have no objection to a couple of small pockets of new houses, but to build on the scale at present proposed by Taylor Wimpey is ludicrous. Taylor Wimpey are only interested in making a vast profit without a thought of the local residents, or the great difficulties it will be to travel around with a huge increase in population.

I strongly urge the Planning Committee to view the site.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/759  Respondent: 10655361 / M Trevill  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7] I OBJECT TO the lack of IMMEDIATE provision for new schools

8] I OBJECT TO the lack of any immediate provision for doctors surgeries

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8237  Respondent: 10662849 / Garry Walton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I1 - Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT. Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.[1] This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s constrol and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.
Residents have been incredulous at the Council’s failure to apply infrastructure constraints to housing numbers, in response first to the Issues and Options paper and then to the 2014 draft local plan. There were 20,000 responses each time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4540  Respondent: 10667073 / Trudi Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4544  Respondent: 10667073 / Trudi Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14001   Respondent: 10670529 / Jennifer McIndoe   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools

I object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5924   Respondent: 10672417 / Matthew Kalupka   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. There is the local school with young children walking along the road on a Monday to Friday basis, which is dangerous with the current level of traffic prior to any increased traffic that would result from further housing on the proposed scale.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5925</th>
<th>Respondent: 10672417 / Matthew Kalupka</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied? In summary the health and safety of existing communities are detrimentally impacted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13446  Respondent: 10701537 / Ben Gamble  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Many of the roads serving our villages are narrow country lanes, which are not fit for high volume of traffic or large HGVs. They already suffer from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/452  **Respondent:** 10701537 / Ben Gamble  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:
"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3837  **Respondent:** 10702561 / Emily Gamble  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Objections to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)
I object in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Local Plan (June 2016), which would have catastrophic effects on the local community, environment and infrastructure should it be approved.

I set out below my objection to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

1. **I object to the Local Plan as the pressure on local services will be overwhelming and unsustainable**

The development of 13,860 homes will have a permanently detrimental impact on existing local communities by over development, particularly for the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon. The doctors’ surgeries and the schools already struggle to accommodate existing residents and such an acute explosion of the population will have disastrous consequences for the community.

I live in Ripley and can never get a GP’s appointment for that day yet the Villages Surgery at Send are no longer booking any appointments for future days as they are too busy. One needs to phone at 8.30am to book an appointment for that day but the phone is always engaged. When one at last gets through no appointments remain and one cannot book for the next or subsequent days for routine appointments.

I have eight month old twins and a three year old and I have had to take them to the Royal Surrey Hospital A&E for problems as I have been unable to see a doctor at my local GP’s surgery.

To so massively increase the burden on this surgery as a result of the Plan would be frankly ludicrous as the surgery is already oversubscribed and this would cause a collapse of the local health system.

There are no railway stations near the sites of Wisley Airfield (A35) and Garlick’s Arch (A43) therefore residents will be reliant on motor vehicles. The local congestion though Ripley village at rush hour is already horrendous, with gridlocked traffic in both directions along the Portsmouth Road. Yet there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. The increase in pollution for my neighbours and myself will be astronomical and detrimental to our children’s health. Such an increase in noxious nitrous oxide fumes would shorten the life expectancy of all residents but I feel the disastrous effect on children’s health, with inevitable increases in asthma, is particularly irresponsible.

It would be infinitely preferable for all constituents and road users if areas such as Guildford and Woking had brownfield sites developed as a robust infrastructure already exists.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
The access road to Send Hill from Potters Lane is a narrow single track road and not suitable for 40 houses and 2 travellers sites. This junction is treacherous with no clear vision if you are coming from Send Hill into Potters Lane. With speeding motorists using Potters Lane as a cut through to and from the A3, any additional traffic will make this junction even more hazardous. My wife and daughter narrowly missed being involved in an accident today on the bend heading from Potters Lane to the Send Hill turning – a large lorry and a Fiat 500 had been involved in an incident where the Fiat had been badly damaged by the lorry where the road is very narrow. The previous week my wife was nearly involved in a head on collision on the same bend with a lorry in the middle of the road as the lorry was too large for the narrow lane, the lorry’s tyre skid marks can be seen on the road. My daughter’s car has been damaged by a passing car coming from Send Hill, where her wing mirror was broken, and my wife has had the same experience, these are not isolated incidents as Send Hill and Potters lane are too narrow for the traffic using them. The proposed development would not be in keeping with the beautiful and peaceful surroundings of the area including the cemetery and the adjoining properties in Send Hill. I understand that the Send Hill Development was not part of any previous consultations and I am concerned about the impact of this level of development on residents and cemetery users.

I also object to the plans for the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley, land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. The infrastructure of Send Village is not able to cope with the existing daily traffic as it is, especially at peak times with commuters and school runs. Most days there is congestion along Send Road. My daughter worked in Ripley for six years and it regularly took her 50 minutes to travel from her house in Westfield to work during peak travel times. This was one of the reasons she chose to move jobs. There are no realistic alternative routes for motorists to take from Send Road and many cars chose to cut through Potters Lane to avoid sitting in traffic, many of which are large lorries who are too big for the road or speeding commuters in cars, which pose daily danger to the residents of Potters Lane, any increase in traffic will only add to the danger.

I would be grateful if you could pass my comments onto the Planning Inspector and confirm safe receipt of this email. I do hope you will take on board my feedback and the feedback of the residents of Send who very much care about the village and its surroundings and who have lived in the village for many years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1144</th>
<th>Respondent: 10717985 / Alison Drennan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to ASP 3 new A3/A3100/B2215/A247 Burpham-Burnt common all-movements junction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to SRN9 A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common) and SRN10 A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5183</th>
<th>Respondent: 10720833 / S Bryon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO LACK OF IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR NEW SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO NO IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR DOCTORS SURGERIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO THE LACK OF ALL INFRASTRUCTURE BEFORE HOUSING &amp; INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO THE ADDED IMPACT ON EXISTING ROADS LINKING: SEND- OLD WOKING, BURNT COMMON- RIPLEY, RIPLEY- E.CLANDON, A3-M25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO IMPROVED PUBLIC TRANSPORT FACILITIES &amp; ACCESS NOT BEING PRIORITISED BEFORE BUILDING IS STARTED.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7814</th>
<th>Respondent: 10721537 / Stephen Niblett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered for the last 30 years for Send and surrounding areas. Existing roads are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels.

It is very clear that the roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope with the massive increases.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9131  Respondent: 10721601 / Vivienne Holden  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our infrastructure in Send, Ripley and Send Marsh and Clandon being already overloaded such that the smallest disruptions cause gridlock over much of our essentially rural roads network please also note that:

- I object to an expanded A3 interchange at Burnt Common,
- I object to housing and business development proposed for land described as Garlick's Arch,
- I object to housing development at Clockbarn Nursery,
- I object to housing development at Send Hill,

all of these sites being unsuitable and in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17913  Respondent: 10722049 / Richard Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the congestion that this development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of existing road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the use of the old Portsmouth Road generally as a ‘rat run’ when congestion at the M25 junction blocks the A3 bypass as it does frequently. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads and nor does it provide a coherent strategy for enabling through traffic to pass without becoming ensnared in local Guildford traffic.

At the present time, Guildford Council appears to be unable to even maintain the existing road infrastructure, which is in appalling condition, and it is therefore difficult to see where the funds will come from for the major investment in road improvements, bypasses and upgraded junctions that will be required to achieve the proposed Local Plan.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time.
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

Many of the narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in these roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk of injury to the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. There is the local school with young children walking along the road on a Monday to Friday basis, which is dangerous with the current level of traffic prior to any increased traffic that would result from further housing on the proposed scale.

I therefore OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

1. I OBJECT to the congestion that this development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of existing road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the use of the old Portsmouth Road generally as a ‘rat run’ when congestion at the M25 junction blocks the A3 bypass as it does frequently. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads and nor does it provide a coherent strategy for enabling through traffic to pass without becoming ensnared in local Guildford traffic.

At the present time, Guildford Council appears to be unable to even maintain the existing road infrastructure, which is in appalling condition, and it is therefore difficult to see where the funds will come from for the major investment in road improvements, bypasses and upgraded junctions that will be required to achieve the proposed Local Plan.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

Many of the narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in these roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk of injury to the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. There is the local school with young children walking along the road on a Monday to Friday basis, which is dangerous with the current level of traffic prior to any increased traffic that would result from further housing on the proposed scale.

I therefore OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5903</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10722593 / D.C. Johnson-Webb</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object because no one seems to have considered how much water and sewage will be used and generated by all the properties proposed for this who le area including Ripley ,Send ,Wisley , Clandon. How are all these new homes and businesses to be serviced? What about Policing Fire and Ambulance services. The Dr.'s Surgery is already struggling, as is the hospital.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11706</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10723553 / Judith Pound</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11723</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10723553 / Judith Pound</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1).The existing services are over-stretched now and infrastructure requirements have not been properly assessed and are inadequate to support the proposed developments.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6970</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10724769 / P. Broughton</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object that no explanation or planning has been given to the impact on the infrastructure i.e.roads, schools, dentists, doctors, congestion, and pollution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8614  Respondent: 10725345 / T. Sharman  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object on the grounds that the roads are not capable of taking the traffic as they already get gridlocked morning and evening the school capacity is not there the Doctors surgery is already impossible to park in front of the shops etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1958  Respondent: 10726561 / L. Boyle  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no clear consideration to the infrastructure requirements. The current infrastructure is already at breaking point and becoming inadequate. Further proposed housing levels, roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope. No adequate consideration has been given for the proposed growth of housing and residents. The A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 are all already at 100% capacity and grid locked at peak times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11884  Respondent: 10727457 / Colin Eke  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I OBJECT to the impact on the infrastructure around the villages. The roads around Send and Ripley are already congested and cannot cope with the current needs. The Local Plan does not incorporate a detailed transport infrastructure strategy that would demonstrate how the road network would support the additional pressure on the roads and other amenities if the proposed development went ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7468  Respondent: 10728481 / Patricia Ray  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I OBJECT to the lack of immediate provision of necessary extra infrastructure, such as schools and medical facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6384  Respondent: 10728993 / Gill Love  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6577  Respondent: 10729281 / Richard Croxford  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the likely impact on the overall road infrastructure of Send village. We are surrounded by lanes, not roads take for example Polesden Lane (where there is only room for one-way traffic in many sections), Newark Lane (with a very narrow mouth and room for one-way movement), Papercourt Lane, Send Barns Lane, Tannery Lane and Potters Lane. At Send Hill, Vicarage Road and Woodhill, the lanes are only wide enough in parts for one-way movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the likely impact on services -such as schools and the GP surgery, It is already very difficult to get a prompt appointment with the medical surgery, and adding more homes will make this even harder. There are no contingency plans for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/447  Respondent: 10729473 / P.T. Elms  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of attention being given by GBC to infrastructure overload.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to what appears to be the gridlocking of Send. Send will be choked by large lorries, many more cars, and therefore dangerous levels of pollution, on top of the close proximity of the A3 and M25. This appears to be a deliberate policy of GBC.

I further object in the above context to the planned 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. Send would be obliterated by the sheer, unsustainable weight of traffic. Who are these people and what sort of people are they who can propose such horror for the entire population of Send?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Blackwell Farm because the knock-on effect will cause chaos to the surrounding area as the infrastructure needs seem not to have been considered honestly.

2. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8241</th>
<th>Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object** generally to the lack of infrastructure. If, which I very much doubt, it is necessary rip up so much Green Belt land in favour of housing, then much infrastructure should be planned for, which in turn will have even more detrimental effect on the rural and semi-rural character of the area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8243</th>
<th>Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object** to the road traffic implications of this proposed Plan upon local roads and on roads further afield. One wonders whether the Councillors making these representations ever actually drive along these roads.

23) **I object** to the effect which these proposals will have on the A3 road in particular which is already beyond capacity, particularly at peak times and most especially on the Guildford By-pass, and which will be infinitely worse if even some of these proposals are imposed on the area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5029</th>
<th>Respondent: 10733089 / Chris Barber</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to express my strong objections to all planning involving large (20+) developments within the Send area. The road system is extremely congested for 2 hours each morning and 3 hours each afternoon into evening with the three lane A3 full to capacity often with 6Km queues both ways encouraging vehicles to then use the Portsmouth Road Burnt...
Common roundabout to Ripley grid-locking that as well. The plans for Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill Farm and Garlick’s Arch are all planning to use the Burnt Common area leading to the proposed new 4 way A3 access. Absolute madness without full infrastructure changes to ALL local roads, schools, medical centres etc. The Brexit vote clearly showed that British people are sick and tired of unthinking and uncaring bureaucracy from Government which is being fulfilled by pressurised councils. The Brexit vote demonstrated people will now stand up to this; it is now Guildford Borough Council’s opportunity to also say NO.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14787</th>
<th>Respondent: 10735777 / S. May</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- Our village schools have no means of taking in more pupils.

- infrastructure has not been thought through and the necessary funding is not in place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/146  Respondent: 10750593 / Jo Williams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is clear to see that the traffic congestion through Ripley and Send is not caused by residents, it is caused by those using the villages, Ripley and Send in particular, as a cut through to Cobham/Byfleet/Weybridge and surrounding areas because of the congestion at the A3 Cobham junction, especially in the mornings. A recommendation would be to consider what improvements could be made here and introduce different traffic calming/deterrents in the villages instead. For one, on the mornings when the traffic lights are not working around the Cobham junction on the A3, slip the cars flow more freely. Creating one way traffic flows in Ripley, especially at Newark Lane, would also make a significant difference to traffic flow - the one way being exit from Newark Lane into Ripley village and remove the option for vehicles to turn from the village into Newark Lane - this is the rat run through to Cobham/Byfleet etc...it would be easy to put a small roundabout in place here to keep traffic moving more readily. Another suggestion, prohibit lorries from delivering to stores in the village between key commuting times as they prevent the easy flow of traffic - it's not rocket science, there are plenty of other options and I haven't seen any evidence of alternatives being considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13090  Respondent: 10756033 / John Herbert  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changes to Green Belt boundaries, This is not justified by any very special circumstances. 3) Finally, test and challenge the proposed scale of development (hopefully largely reduced through 1) and 2) above) on the smaller communities scattered throughout the borough. Each area has to take some of the strain however large service facilities planted within smaller communities that have no need for the scale of service provided naturally leads to unnecessary traffic, congestion and public aggravation that can be avoided by placing the facilities more centrally to where they are required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13092  Respondent: 10756033 / John Herbert  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the fact that the infrastructure has not been properly assessed and, in my opinion, is inadequate to deal with the proposed housing levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6934  Respondent: 10756449 / Richard and Valerie Overton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses will lead to even more dangerous conditions and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6942  Respondent: 10756449 / Richard and Valerie Overton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4995  Respondent: 10758593 / Richard & Delia Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure.

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4997  **Respondent:** 10758593 / Richard & Delia Baker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )**, is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity.
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12222</th>
<th>Respondent: 10765249 / Andy &amp; Sonja Freebody</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. This will increase the risk of serious accidents.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon where I live, already suffer from intolerable traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network, phone and broadband and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital; where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/639  Respondent: 10765249 / Andy & Sonja Freebody  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits “…we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?
The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

**Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections**

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Having lived in West Horsley for the last 12 years, I have been recently presented with some facts about the suggested Guildford borough plan 2016.

The areas marked for development are vast and clearly inappropriate for the Horsleys. The volume of the housing that could potentially be developed would severely compromise an already struggling village in my opinion.

The majority of the residents in both west and east horsley are retired or elderly individuals and young families. The health center is already at its maximum as are the parking areas in and around the village on weekdays & weekends. Has there been any consideration at all as to the effect a further 500 homes (or 1500 cars) will have on the infrastructure of the village?? How will the existing long standing residents of this beautiful village get around when many have their only means of transport as a car?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I am utterly opposed to the suggestions for the local plan on the basis that it is simply not a viable suggestion to the village, its roads, and its long standing residents. I believe we should be thankful to have such a beautiful village in Surrey, and that the Horsleys should firmly remain part of the green belt – not subject to mass development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17011  **Respondent:** 10773153 / Miles Palmer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I OBJECT**, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

**I OBJECT** to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a hugely popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic the traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. **I OBJECT** to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/202  Respondent: 10773377 / Margaret & Morten Frisch  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Infrastructure such as water and sewage systems, electricity and gas infrastructure, roads, schools at all levels, railway transportation and parking; all need to be substantially up-graded before the local housing stock can be expanded by many thousands of units as proposed.
2. Health centres and hospital are already being operated at above capacity. Major medical and hospital investments together with new retirement homes are required in this area before a large increase in the population can be allowed.
3. East Horsley cannot accommodate another 533 housing units as proposed for the reasons stated above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13602  Respondent: 10773441 / Barry Marshall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11548</th>
<th>Respondent: 10774145 / P Jordan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment.
without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/634</th>
<th>Respondent: 10774881 / Kate Cheyne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of plans for provision of services eg. doctors, schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/5313  Respondent: 10775137 / Wendy Lodge  Agent:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also find it surprising that Guildford Borough Council are prepared to make such far reaching decisions when they did not have their own Transport Assessment to guide them. It suggests they want their plan to go through, no matter the consequences to the residents of Send Village. The infrastructure of Send and Ripley will not cope with such a high increase in population as envisaged under these new plans. I fear for the future of the children in our village. Have you even considered how they will all be educated? As for health care, I know as both a patient, but also a former employee of our GP surgery, that this facility could not cope with this huge increase in patients.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/7242  Respondent: 10775169 / Caroline Grafton  Agent:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes will lead to flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/1787  Respondent: 10776225 / Roger Main  Agent:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1 – Infrastructure and Delivery

I OBJECT. The infrastructure in the borough – roads, water, sewerage, schools, medical services – is already stretched. There appears to be no plan for providing the necessary infrastructure so that it is ready for the demands which would be placed upon it were the plan ever to be implemented.

Many of the sites – particularly in the villages – are effectively on greenfield sites, with no existing infrastructure. GBC must know that adding infrastructure is not simply a matter of digging a hole and connecting to an existing service. A whole range of services will need massive upgrading to cope with the increased demand, but there is no indication of how this is going to happen.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10198  Respondent: 10780929 / Naren Nanda  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10204  Respondent: 10780929 / Naren Nanda  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

The need for a secondary school is not necessary. Surrey is expanding its secondary schools. St Peters and County Ash Manor and Kings College are under subscribed.

No provision has been made in the plan for the increased traffic that will be generated by these changes. With [text unreadable] expanding, huge volumes of commuter journeys from outside the borough could occur. The A323 will be overloaded. The pavements are narrow and uneven and on a windy day could easily blow a pedestrian into the road.

Having lived in Normandy since 1963 I have noticed the increase in traffic noise already and it will only get worse.

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1397  Respondent: 10780961 / Hillary Ingle  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The need for a secondary school is not necessary. Surrey is expanding its secondary schools. St Peters and County Ash Manor and Kings College are under subscribed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1402  Respondent: 10780961 / Hillary Ingle  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

No provision has been made in the plan for the increased traffic that will be generated by these changes. With [text unreadable] expanding, huge volumes of commuter journeys from outside the borough could occur. The A323 will be overloaded. The pavements are narrow and uneven and on a windy day could easily blow a pedestrian into the road.

Having lived in Normandy since 1963 I have noticed the increase in traffic noise already and it will only get worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/4043  Respondent: 10781729 / Sylvia Williams  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Nearly 500 extra houses for East and West Horsley could result in a possible 1000 more cars on our narrow country roads, fighting for parking spaces at our shops, the station, the doctors and school areas. And if you query the figure of 1000 cars, I assure you that on the estate where I live almost every house has two cars in their drive, some have three.

No provision is made in the plan for extra school places [Raleigh is already full], extra medical facilities [our doctor’s surgery just copes at the moment but it is sometimes impossible to park there], improved public transport [4-5 busses a day through West Horsley at present] and if wanting to use the train service to London will people walk to the station, I doubt it!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4048  Respondent: 10781729 / Sylvia Williams  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

No provision has been made in the plan for the extra services that would be needed such as school places, medical services, public transport, improved roads, more shops and parking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1421  Respondent: 10782625 / Heather Alexander  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road Ispecifically object to:

   1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
   2. The increased volume of car A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
   3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
   4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
   5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil
secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

6. The lack of suitable public transport and The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5975  
Respondent: 10782849 / Peter Blake  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the principle of any plan that fails to recognise what the traffic problems presently suffering in Send (A247) are created by the extra burden to allow access to the A3 for “Woking” traffic - aggravated by the introduction of so-called “40 ton lorries”.

Has anyone on the committee taken the trouble to see for Him/Her self, traffic conditions in this area on a week day, term time, 08:30 – 09:20+?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6  
Respondent: 10783425 / Caron Hill  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing with my objection to the new local plan. I’m objecting on the grounds of transport links, access to medical and educational facilities, as well as the complete disregard for the greenbelt. Firstly, the Tannery Lane proposal of 45 homes would bring the already grid locked Send Road (at peak times) to a halt as a potential 90 additional cars turning onto Send Road would cause traffic chaos. The site at the top of Send Hill also has no capacity for additional traffic. Both of these roads are accessed by Send Road or tiny lanes with few passing points. The lack of decent public transport in Send means that cars are essential with a lot of families needing 2 or more vehicles. The entrance on to the A3 is something that is required already. Adding 400 homes to Garlicks Copse will no longer alleviate the existing traffic burden and will add extra local traffic on Portsmouth Road / Send Road which you will still have to get across to get to
the new junction. There is no possibility of scaling up the capacity of either the doctors surgery or the school to accommodate the proposed volume of new residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2031  
Respondent: 10784385 / Rosemary Washbourne  
Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to protest most strongly against the New Local Plan for at least 533 more houses proposed for East and West Horsley as the infrastructure would not be able to cope.

It would mean:-

1) an even longer wait to get an appointment with a doctor

2) the local schools would not have spaces an increase in the number of children

3) There would not be enough car parking spaces at Horsley station - the present car park is not adequate for what is required now.

4) sometimes one cannot get into the car park behind the shops - with more houses it would be even more difficult.

5) the exit from Thatcher's Hotel on to the A246 would become even more dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16185  
Respondent: 10784769 / Jane Baker  
Agent:

Document: Propposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9128  
Respondent: 10785633 / Penelope Eagle  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
causes greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/850  **Respondent:** 10798049 / Steve & Maureen Knight  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object - Infrastructure needs to be in place prior to any development starting

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/233  **Respondent:** 10798977 / Ian Brooks  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in the Ripley, Send Marsh, Send and the lack of infrastructure planning relating to sites A43, A58, A35 and A42

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlick’s Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

Proposing housing at sites A43, A58, A35 and A42 has been increased significantly since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Ripley which is already used as a short cut between the M25 and Woking. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states...
“Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.”

Despite this there are no proposals to improve the local roads and only limited junction improvements on the A3 the result of which will be to exacerbate Ripley’s use as a ‘rabbit run’. The effect of this neglect will be to increase congestion on the Trunk and Local road network and developers will be long gone with their profits before the borough Council has to face up to the inadequacies of this key infrastructure provision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/321  **Respondent:** 10799169 / Neal Basson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Village facilities**

The infrastructure of the West Horsley, as well as East Horsley cannot support a potential effective doubling of the households and residents.

The villages are extremely rural in character. East Horsley has one public house, a church, a hotel, very few shops, and not one state school. The two boys only private schools already produce significant traffic problems at each end of the school day on Ockham Road North and the A246.

Secondary school places are limited at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools are a greater travelling distance from the village.

West Horsley alone includes no less than 41 listed buildings, some dating back to the 15th century. West Horsley has one shop, no post office and one highly over-subscribed school.

The single medical centre shared between East and West Horsley is similarly over-subscribed and residents have difficulty in getting appointments. Such a massive increase in population as proposed would stretch this service to beyond breaking point. The planned population increase for the Borough would also mean a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to allow it to cope.

Parking facilities are extremely limited in the shopping areas of East and West Horsley, as well as Horsley station. The impact of such a large increase in population as proposed would overstretch these facilities. It would make it difficult if not impossible for many of the older and less mobile inhabitants to reach the shops, and most importantly the medical centre and chemist.

**Roads**

Traffic generation from the proposed development would be considerable, with most households having two cars, many with three.

The Street, which constitutes the only entry to West Horsley from the A246, is very narrow, and it would not be possible to widen it. This road is already often perilous, particularly when large lorries, buses and tractors pass through. To increase such traffic, which would result if the proposed developments were to proceed would be wholly irresponsible.

**Transport**
• West Horsley’s bus service through the village is extremely limited and only operates two/three times per day Monday to Friday.
• The bus service running from Guildford to Leatherhead travels along the A246 at the southern end of the village and is really only of use to residents living within a maximum of eight to ten minutes walk from the bus stops at the Bell and Colvill roundabout.
• Parking at Horsley station is limited and sometimes full on a weekday. There is no land to create additional parking for the increased need that the proposed expansion would bring.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/345  Respondent: 10799169 / Neal Basson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I 1 Infrastructure and delivery

OBJECT Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The Council’s methodology assessing traffic and roads infrastructure needs is inadequate. It identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18391  Respondent: 10799169 / Neal Basson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The Council’s methodology assessing traffic and roads infrastructure needs is inadequate. It identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient
consideration. Some proposed locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/485</th>
<th>Respondent: 10799169 / Neal Basson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council’s methodology assessing traffic and roads infrastructure needs is inadequate. It identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place.

OBJECT Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17542</th>
<th>Respondent: 10799425 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Susan Parker)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We OBJECT to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery

We OBJECT to this policy as it stands. Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The methodology commissioned by the Council to assess traffic and the corresponding roads infrastructure needs is inadequate for the purpose of the Local Plan and identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion.
Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Under the growth proposed some locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. Even the A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

With regard to SANG provision, GBC has demonstrated that it has no genuine interest in conserving and enhancing biodiversity and clearly regards the Thames Basin Heaths SPA as an obstacle to be overcome rather than a valued asset. This is underlined at the end of the Policy wording which indicates that the council is more interested in meeting its legal responsibilities than actually protecting wildlife. GBC is failing to take account of existing biodiversity at sites selected for SANG provision.

Some infrastructure, as identified in Figure 1 of the draft IDP- is within the control and remit of Guildford Borough Council – they have some influence in relation to planning – but much is under the control, and is the fiscal responsibility of, Surrey County Council or Highways England.

It is not realistic to assume that car use can effectively be replaced for all or even many users. Those who are disabled or infirm cannot easily substitute car journeys with bike travel: the elderly; the disabled; those caring for young children (particularly uncertain bike users and those with multiple children to care for); those wishing to use cars for supermarket or other bulky shopping; those who wish to commute to work and have no facilities for showering or changing on arrival; those who have lengthy and tiring commutes at present, for which the car is the final (short) element of a long journey (for those commuting into London from outside Guildford, a daily 3 hour commute is typical; this cannot realistically be extended by extensive cycling). All these factors mean that the replacement of the car with cycle use is likely to be overstated by many studies, particularly given narrow roads which do not allow effective or safe bike lanes.

Funding is not the only - nor the main - obstacle to improving infrastructure within the borough, and this seems not to be recognized. Guildford is a gap town, set in a bowl within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the south of the borough, and with large sections of the borough affected by the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area to the north. There is a ribbon through the middle of the borough which contains rail and road links to London, but is already heavily congested, is Green Belt, AONB, SPA or more than one of the above. Very little of the borough is available for extensive development of infrastructure or any building. Do we really want solutions that involve driving new roads through our remaining countryside – including the AONB – at huge cost in financial and environmental terms. Such solutions may be the only ones left when the inadequacies of this proposed Local Plan are realised after the event.

Policy indicates note an intention to pool Community Infrastructure Levy from most new build development and to use CIL receipts to assist in provision of infrastructure needed to support the delivery of the plan. As with other aspects of planning, there is a failure to recognize that out of town settlements in particular have particularly high requirements for additional new basic infrastructure in order to exist at all – roads, sewers, water provision, electricity, gas, telephone and broadband links will all need to be provided and in many cases the links to existing services will need to be upgraded before these can be implemented. The ability to divert funds from CIL to other uses will be inherently limited, not least that otherwise the proposed settlements will not be able to function. The Council strategy of taking CIL from new build in the Green Belt seems to be to pay for roads within the town centre, as indicated in the policy which notes that legislation prevents the use of planning obligations to fund existing infrastructure deficits.

In the reasoned justification, it is indicated that the council will be prepared to negotiate if an applicant claims that the infrastructure requirements for their development make it unviable. This means that some developments will go ahead anyway and worsen the infrastructure deficit. The Policy claims that infrastructure needed “should” be provided and available when first needed but we have no confidence in the council enforcing this.

The absolute constraint on developmental capacity within the borough represented by the infrastructure limitations cannot be swept aside, but the council has ignored this and failed to apply a constraint on the housing number.
We are not convinced that the extent of existing traffic congestion has been fully recognised by the SCC transport assessment because the methodology employed waters down the level of traffic observed. This has knock-on effects when modelling the various development scenarios. The result is that the requirements identified (expensive though they may seem) are the tip of the iceberg. One of the easiest issues to understand is the use of average peak hour flows for the baseline data. SCC acknowledge that that this is “typically lower” (see Transport Assessment 4.13.4 but GBC prefer the averaging approach with some eloquent wording in their Headline network metrics (3.9). A much better solution would have been to collect reliable baseline data that allowed for the effects of queuing and modelled each hour (or a shorter time period). Such an approach would have cost more but GBC seem unwilling to go the extra mile for reliable evidence while being content to spend large sums of money on propaganda exercises such as their one-sided video. There are other more technical reasons why the transport assessment methodology fails to fully identify current and planned congestion.

Planned developments for Guildford and Waverley Boroughs were modelled together but growth for the rest of the UK was allowed for only using the DoT forecasts. As a result it is not clear whether adequate allowance has been made for significant developments planned for Woking and other neighbouring Boroughs. This represents an inconsistency in approach with the West Surrey SHMA.

Many of the results for the PM peak are missing (TA 4.1.11 states that “these can be set out in an addendum report at a later date”). We believe that those who need to travel on the roads in peak hours will be every bit as interested in their future journeys home as they are for going to work. Publication of the Transport Assessment was delayed until the start of the consultation period so perhaps the non-inclusion of many PM results was simply a result of running out of time.

The Model Development Validation Report does include some interesting baseline data that may be of interest to residents in terms of local knowledge of traffic.

We are not convinced that it would be practical or desirable to end up in a position where the only solution to traffic congestion is to build many more new roads as by-passes through the Surrey countryside, or turn existing roads into dual carriageways, or demolish buildings (some of which may be historic) in order to accommodate higher capacity junctions in built-up areas.

It is noted that the infrastructure Development Plan was developed using hotspots identified in “OGSTAR” (the previous Transport Assessment used for the 2014 consultation) as a starting point. (See Transport Topic Paper (5.56)). However, the site list used for OGSTAR was not even compatible with the former draft Local Plan let alone the current one. Despite this, the Key Evidence mentions the June 2016 TA but not OGSTAR.

Appendix C (Infrastructure Schedule) is lacking in detail concerning what work will actually be carried out for most of the Local Road Network projects and the cost estimates are clearly at the guesswork stage suggesting that these schemes have not been fully thought through or checked for viability. If more detail is available then why not provide it.

It is not clear whether CIL will be received in time to put the required infrastructure in place for each development – or what penalties will be applied for late payment.

The Monitoring Indicators rely entirely on annual CIL receipts and spending. Surely they should look at actual infrastructure delivery and any changes in its adequacy.

The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/13428  Respondent: 10800065 / David Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13434  Respondent: 10800065 / David Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2535  Respondent: 10803009 / M Robson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the evidence provided in terms of Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA). The number of foreign students has been wrongly used to inflate the need.

I object to evidence of infrastructure assessment. Infrastructure overload is a major concern. Unnecessary road deaths have occurred at London Road South B2215 due to inadequate road management, maintenance, etc... GBC is culpable and to increase traffic load with such poor management standards risks further unnecessary road deaths. Congestion during rush hour, inclement weather, road obstacles, etc. drives the entire area into gridlock.

I object to proposed inadequate assessment of infrastructure solutions. Our property on London Road already suffers from the volume and scale of traffic causing damage to the structure of the property. The noise and pollution already adversely affects my small children. This is unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
OBJECT Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The Council’s methodology assessing traffic and roads infrastructure needs is inadequate. It identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the extra congestion that these developments will cause to our local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our roads are struggling already in our local villages and this plan will exacerbate the amount of traffic in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no proposed plans to improve the current roads.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition, unlit and have no pavements. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify or provide for adequate infrastructure improvements to support the massive scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12424  Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our roads are struggling already in our local villages and this plan will exacerbate the amount of traffic in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no proposed plan to improve

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition, unlit and have no pavements. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12429  Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan does not identify or provide for adequate infrastructure improvements to support the massive scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12451  Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12470  **Respondent:** 10805537 / Robert Mote  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/88  **Respondent:** 10806465 / Moya Miller  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The proposal at Garlicks Arch for 400 houses will produce far too great a strain on the existing medical services which are stretched now.

The new Send school which will be for children from 5 - 11, is planned to absorb a specific number of children already in the area and will be unable to contend with the proposed population.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/135  **Respondent:** 10806849 / Chris Duffy  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Currently the Council still has to repair holes in the road that have been unattended since the winter of 2014. Telephone and internet connections have been frequently cut off. Repairs to the water supply has cut off supplies. Already the police are unable to cope with numerous robberies that occur each month and some children cannot get into the local school.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
1) Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems.

2) Much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support developments and for this to be in place as needed (listed in Appx. C to the Plan). Even if this happens the Plan admits “we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes”. This will be most acutely felt at junctions but these effects have apparently not been analysed so that we don’t know the location or impact.

3) We can be sure however that the cumulative effects of the developments in the north east of Guildford will have a devastating impact on the A247 through the villages of West Clandon and Send. It is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposals in the Plan (Appx. C) will do anything to mitigate this impact. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and it is freely admitted by SCC that they have little money available.

4) The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see Appx. C). I question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be challenged in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash required to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete, even assuming there are funds to provide it.

5) If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the Green Belt and its future rendered uncertain.

6) All of these developments will draw very large amounts of additional traffic to the A247. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to Gosden Hill schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel south and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the south and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)
- SCC’s business plan for Newlands Corner

I would like to point out that although the A247 is classified as an A road, it has none of the characteristics because it:
- is less than 2 vehicles wide in places. Larger vehicles routinely mount the only pavement.
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge over the railway, with poor site lines
- has a dangerous junction to access the station
- has a dangerous and unlit junction with the southbound A3 on-slip road
- has a primary school accessed by narrow pavements
- is largely unlit
- is already very congested at times, more so when delays on the A3 are severe

In summary, the A247 is quite unsuited to coping with additional traffic and it is very clear that the developments proposed in the 2017 Local Plan will increase the amount of traffic on this road over and above that in the 2016 draft to which residents strongly objected. There is nothing in the Infrastructure Schedule which addresses this issue. Indeed several of the infrastructure proposals will themselves lead to significant increases in traffic on the A247.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11051  
**Respondent:** 10809377 / Bernice Williams  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** [ ]  
**is Sound?** [ ]  
**is Legally Compliant?** [ ]

1. POLICY II

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an even more popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough's infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan's determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3336  **Respondent:** 10811233 / David Storrar  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object</strong> to the proposal to significantly increase the housing numbers and hence population of East Horsley, without concrete proposals to improve the village infrastructure to take account of that increase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11895  **Respondent:** 10811361 / Simon Crago  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object</strong> to Policy I1 due to the increased congestion that the development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I believe the additional traffic flows will bring increased numbers of accidents, and increase in noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9551  Respondent: 10811553 / J.D. Howard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As I have written before.

The Doctors are overworked now. How will they cope with hundreds more!

Car parking is not easy.

Roads already busy.

Schools are having problems.

I object to being removed from the Green Belt.

I chose to move here I like it as it is.

Why overcrowd the area and spoil the district?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12361  Respondent: 10811681 / Linda Knight  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads. This is currently a rural area and many no roads have no suitable pedestrian footpaths or safe crossing points. I have made complaints about the dangers of these roads to pedestrians and that the lack of footpaths discourages healthy maans of transport like cycling and walking and the situation will not be improved by more cars and unsustainable volumes of traffic
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12367  Respondent: 10811681 / Linda Knight  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslpp171/843  Respondent: 10811745 / Ann and David R. Wright  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In view of flawed new evidence, Guildford’s proposal for more than 12,426 homes (plus a buffer of 1,155 homes) is excessive and will result in needless loss of Green Belt and green character, and increased congestion, that cannot be justified in our heavily constrained borough.

Traffic congestion, which is already severe, is set to get worse over the plan period.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/565  Respondent: 10812225 / John Murrie  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

New Local Plan 2016 - The Horsleys Main Sites

I have received outline details of the proposed building of houses in and around East and West Horsley in the New Local Plan.

I feel able only to make general comments and observations as follows.
I accept and understand the need for further housing now and in the future but the type, number and location must be carefully chosen.

Due regard must be given to the provision of different types of housing to match the population needs.

Whilst the numbers may be dictated by the demand it is essential that improvement of the infrastructure must go hand in glove with further house building. Special attention must be paid to availability of schools and doctors. The layout and condition of the roads around and through the villages is also a significant issue. Inevitably an increase in households will mean an increase in traffic on already congested and difficult road layouts. Such are the physical problems in certain places (e.g. Ockham road South) I would suggest that this issue alone may incur a natural limit on the number of new households which can sensibly be accommodated. What might help to alleviate this problem would be if it was possible to control the passage of so many heavy commercial/industrial vehicles.

The locations of further development must be chosen sensitively with due regard for the Green Belt status and any encroachment kept to an absolute minimum.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Infrastructure is already overloaded. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The village suffers from a high water level in the ground and at times water logged fields overflow onto the roads. If the fields are built on this will compound surface water problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The surrounding roads including A3 and M25 often get gridlocked and many drivers including me have given up on them and started using our village roads as a cut-through instead. So adding 100's of new families into the area will add perhaps 1000 extra cars onto local roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Street and East lane have narrow sections and suffer congestion at either end particularly with drop-offs at Glenesk and Cranmore schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase in traffic will cause longer queues and congestion and increase risks of road safety and accidents to residents on foot and bikes, and the drivers themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase in population will overload already stretched resources such as a doctors surgery already stretched to the limit and shops and parking. The planned population increase (in excess of Government ONS forecasts) for the Borough will require a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to cope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The state schools eg Raleigh and Howard of Effingham are overloaded already, so as far I can see there is no planning if infrastructure roads, resources and amenities to support the development.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6874  Respondent: 10816673 / G Hall  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are known sewage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North / Green Lane area. Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley, will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advise ‘a 2 to 3 years lead-in period’ to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appeal to GBC to wake up to their responsibilities to protect their residents and the environment, from this massive reckless plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12220  Respondent: 10816993 / Jane Roberts  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. This will increase the risk of serious accidents.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon where I live, already suffer from intolerable traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network, phone and broadband and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital; where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6114  **Respondent:** 10817121 / Roger Adams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Policies I1, I2 and I3**

There are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of East and West Horsley as it is today. Barely a day goes past without a complaint being made on social media about it – be it schools, roads, medical facilities and so on, The aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the proposed Local Plan (see my comments on Policy S1 above) can only exacerbate this problem.

I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in The Horsleys today:

- Roads across the parishes are in poor condition with many potholes.
- The principal through roads are narrow and winding and have a series of pinch points where it is difficult for vehicles to pass one another. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.”
- These ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic. They struggle to cope with current levels of traffic at times, particularly the increasing numbers of large vehicles such as HGVs using them.
- They are used by schoolchildren to walk or cycle to school. Increases in traffic volumes without improvements in infrastructure must increase the risk of accidents to them.
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are also sections with no or narrow pavements and which are poorly lit.
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains.
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

In respect of East Horsley, I believe there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:
LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. The proposal is unclear to me. It says that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. Funding is needed now to sort out the existing problems I have mentioned previously - not from some unspecified source at an unspecified future date.

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan. As stated above it is already at capacity and, with an ageing population, this problem will not decrease. Such expansion is therefore needed now!

Local primary schooling is also a very pressing issue which I know East Horsley Parish Council has raised with you in its objections. East and West Horsley are currently served by a single primary school - The Raleigh in West Horsley – which has no spare capacity as far as I am aware. The 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley would result in 593 new houses in the two parishes. Planning guidance suggest that to accommodate the children from these new homes around 150 additional primary school places will be required. No proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in The Horsleys.

The proposed developments in The Horsleys and Wisley will put further strain on the existing infrastructure, increasing traffic, patient numbers, requirement for school places and so forth. Thus existing problems will be exacerbated. There are no proposals to solve these or at least to improve the situation.

I OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals as I believe that the failure to address the current inadequacies of the existing infrastructure is a serious shortcoming in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

Also I OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments set out in the Site Policies.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/468  Respondent: 10818177 / Heather Coussens  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? () , is Sound? () , is Legally Compliant? ()

I object to the amount of extra traffic and pollution these proposals will bring. It currently takes me 3 minutes at 8.45am to exit from Boughton Hall Ave, cross the carriageway and join the Portsmouth Road to join Send Barnes Lane going into Woking. I then queue all the way down the hill into Send. At night I have the same long journey. Any problems on the A3 send traffic along the Portsmouth Road too. The volume is already set to rise, regardless of many objections following the Councils permission for the building of Send Marina.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3762  Respondent: 10818337 / Jim Hartley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? () , is Sound? () , is Legally Compliant? ()
Prior to any new development it’s impact on the currently overstretched road network, schools, medical services, transport and other infrastructure services needs to be properly assessed and then satisfied in advance or at least as an integral part of the Planning Approval. Your Plan relies on the future introduction of an Infrastructure Levy to be raised against all developments based on the scale of development involved. The proceeds of this levy would be used by the local authority to either fully fund or subsidise improvements to facilities and infrastructure. The Plan contains no detailed methodology by which this would be achieved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12230  Respondent: 10819009 / Sheila Griffin  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford does not have the infrastructure to cope with large scale housing. It already has severe traffic problems and pollution, a shortage of school places, and pressure on GP surgeries and the RSCH resulting in long waiting times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/225  Respondent: 10819297 / Phil Haymes  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• The scale of the development is disproportionate to the current number of dwellings (77% increase!) and given the proposed massive development at Wisley Airfield a short distance away I believe this will place an unreasonable burden on the Horsley’s for which current stressed infrastructure (roads, schools, parking, other amenities) would not be able to cope.

• From a HSE perspective volumes of traffic would significantly increase on roads already struggling to cope and one assumes would become significantly more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists alike as traffic density increases.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/362  Respondent: 10820385 / Marion Gooding  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I want to protest that the application for the development of Blackwell Farm and the ensuing traffic problems this will cause on the A3. This part of the A3 is over burdened with traffic and is already dangerous. The amount of extra traffic this development will cause is unsupportable given the present road infrastructure. Heavy congestion both North and South on the A3 around this development will be immense and the fact that the health services and schools are already under severe pressure means that there is no case at all for such a huge development without the supporting road, health and educational infrastructure being put into place at the time of the development. The roads around this site are not only congested but environmentally they cause huge amounts of pollution and so I would like to strongly protest that this application to develop this site is not sound.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have serious concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and whether the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The amended Plan has reduced the proposed number of new homes and stated a percentage would be affordable, there is no mention of what affordable would be, compared to Guildford property prices affordable even with benefit of various government schemes would price out local people.

Traffic proposals are key to any developments, the Draft Plan makes reference to several ideas, all subject to government funding, any development should also be subject to the road infrastructure being in place, hospital provision to provide for a growing and aged population, better access for emergency services. One suggestion in the plan is to have a traffic flow through the business park past the hospital and towards Tesco roundabout, these areas are insufficient for an increased flow, already at capacity at peak times, what impact would volume from 1800 plus homes have?

Not many families would travel by bus or from proposed rail station as the services are likely to be infrequent. Many residents would travel by car to rail station increasing CO2 emissions adding to delays in the Park area. The Onslow Park & Ride has to be accessed by car and is too far from the proposed schemes for an improved take up.

The Draft Plan makes little reference to leisure and recreational increased facilities for the expanding population at family affordable prices, not the inflated hire costs at Surrey Sports Park which can be paid by adults but not the young of the Borough. Where are the next football pitches, open spaces to kick around, basketball and netball courts which are free to use to encourage young people to be active.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- Water, Gas, Electricity, Sewage and Drainage – I do not believe that there is sufficient capacity to cater for the additional developments.
- Highway Safety – The roads in East and West Horsley are relatively narrow and the visibility is often poor, therefore any substantial increase in traffic would lead to more accidents. I recommend that a full traffic and capacity study should be carried out prior to any development being approved. Any necessary highway improvements should also be submitted for comment. We are often subjected to speeding cars and lorries past our house.
- Pavements in East Lane, Ockham Road South and North are narrow and as a consequence a hazard for pedestrians, especially women with prams and toddlers. The additional traffic would make matters worse.
- There is not any provision on the roads in Horsley for cyclists. I was witness to a fatal cycling accident outside my house.
- There is not sufficient parking at the railway station at present so any increase of population would exacerbate the situation. I also understand that the trains at peak hours are very crowded with standing room only.
- There is often insufficient parking in the village centre.
- A large number of new houses would completely change the character of the village.

The above comments are primarily concerned with East and West Horsley. The major development proposed at Wisley Airport would further exacerbate these issues.

Of the sites proposed the area south I most strongly object to the area A41 south of East Lane. It destroys the character of the road having open land on the south side and would lead to an increase of pressure of more development to link with the remainder of housing on East Lane on the southern side.

On the above grounds I object to the Draft Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/3111  Respondent: 10829409 / Anne Fulton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attachment documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5859  Respondent: 10830785 / PE Whatley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the way the lack of required infrastructure has been swept to one side as if it is unimportant and the only thing that matters is getting more in homes in Guildford regardless of the effects on the existing population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attachment documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11815  Respondent: 10831393 / Catherine Ryder  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to placing further loading on an already overloaded local infrastructure.

The proposed addition of over 70% to the number of houses within two or three miles of Horsley (East and West Horsley, and nearby Ockham) has major implications for almost every aspect of life here in the village - public transport, schools, doctors and the medical centre, drainage and water supply, and roads and parking. Road traffic in this part of Surrey is already close to twice the national average. The main roads serving East Horsley are already too narrow for passing lorries, and cars are often squeezed on to the pavement. Be assured that no amount of analysis will alter the bare fact that the roads serving Horsley are not, and cannot be made, suitable for the level of building in the area that you envisage.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attachment documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13541  Respondent: 10831681 / James Cope  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17699</th>
<th>Respondent: 10832321 / Robert Deatker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES This section of the Proposed Submission Local Plan sets out details covering a range of infrastructure policies.

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3 These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst I support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give us cause for concern.

I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem. I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains. Any substantial development as indicated within the Local Plan will increase hard surfaces in the area and therefore the rainfall runoff will increase into local watercourses and exasperate localised flooding.
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.
- Train services to and from Horsley to London on the ‘Guildford via Cobham’ line are already at full capacity at peak times. The current service has to be substantially improved BEFORE allowing further development. Such improvements should include additional train services and additional stations to support new communities.

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council, South West Trains or utility companies. Surely GBC must see the infrastructure improved first before approving any new developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
IOBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11851  Respondent: 10835617 / Glenis Pycraft  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Local Plan based on the fact that the infrastructure of Send and Send Marsh is wholly inadequate, and cannot cope with the increase volume of traffic and population. Our schools, nursery and The Villages surgery are under immense pressure already, and could not cope with such a proposed increase in population. The road system would also be unable to take the increased volume, with the very real risk of not only gridlock, but increased risk of accidents to drivers, cyclists and pedestrians (including children at Send Primary and St Bede’s schools). However, any further development of the road system would destroy the Send Marsh and Send village, which act as the essential buffer between Woking and Guildford. The plan is entirely unsuited to the area, and so I urge you to abandon it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5818  Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>I object to there being a lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan does not include adequate infrastructure improvements to accommodate such a massive development. The area is already overloaded and there is no thought for police/emergency services provision for the extra 5000+ houses planned in the Local Plan in the north-east of the Borough. At Garlick’s Arch (A43) for instance, local services, sewerage, utilities, doctors and schools are already at full capacity but there is no infrastructure projects envisaged in the Plan so the development is untenable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/5820  Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  Agent: |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 |
| **Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )** |
| 1. **I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure** |
| There is no plan to improve the main roads in Send, Clandon and Ripley which are already overly congested. As for the smaller, rural roads - these are often narrow or single track, in poor condition with no pedestrian provision. In rush hour these roads are used as alternatives. Any more traffic (from large housing developments) would be dangerous and unsustainable. |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| **Attached documents:** |

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/16673  Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  Agent: |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 |
| **Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )** |
| **I object to there being a lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)** |
| The Local Plan does not include adequate infrastructure improvements to accommodate such a massive development. The area is already overloaded and there is no thought for police/emergency services provision for the extra 5000+ houses planned in the Local Plan in the north-east of the Borough. At Garlick’s Arch (A43) for instance, local services, sewerage, utilities, doctors and schools are already at full capacity but there is no infrastructure projects envisaged in the Plan so the development is untenable. |
| **I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)** |
There is no plan to improve the main roads in Send, Clandon and Ripley which are already overly congested. As for the smaller, rural roads - these are often narrow or single track, in poor condition with no pedestrian provision. In rush hour these roads are used as alternatives. Any more traffic (from large housing developments) would be dangerous and unsustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4806  **Respondent:** 10836097 / B.V. Dabbs  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO NO CONFIRMATION FOR ALLEGED HOUSING NEED NOS. I OBJECT TO LACK OF IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR NEW SCHOOLS

I OBJECT TO NO IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR DOCTORS SURGERIES

I OBJECT TO THE LACK OF ALL INFRASTRUCTURE BEFORE HOUSING & INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

I OBJECT TO THE ADDED IMPACT ON EXISTING ROADS LINKING: SEND -OLD WOKING, BURNT COMMON -RILEY, RILEY -E.CLANDON, A3-M25

I OBJECT TO PRIORITISING GREEN BELT DEVELOPMENT OVER BROWNFIELD WHICH COULD SUPPORT 50% BUILDING

I OBJECT TO INCORRECT HANDLING OF DEVELOPMENT THROUGH REGULATION 19 INSTEAD OF REGULATION 18

I OBJECT TO FURTHER INDUSTRIAL SPACE AT BURNT COMMON AFTER THE 80% REDUCTION IN EMPLOYMENT SPACE IN 2013

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7065  **Respondent:** 10837089 / R. Robertson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Infrastructure of Normandy cannot support the development of site A46.

**Highways**

Site A46 is bounded by Glaziers Lane (060) and Westward Lane (C16). Both of these are 'Lanes' by definition- not roads. Lane is defined as a narrow way or road. In particular Glaziers Lane is unclassified. It is narrow with blind bends with a steep blind hump back bridge (over a railway line) at skewed angle. In the main there is only a foot path on one side of the lane but this changes from one side to the other and back again at the most dangerous positions possible -
one by a sharp blind bend with no sight lines forcing people to cross actually on the bend and hope no vehicles are coming as the sight line doesn't materialise until you are halfway across the lane (the site of a fatal road accident some years ago). The other at the base of the hump back bridge where there is no sight line of oncoming vehicles due to the blind summit. Because of the narrowness of much of the footpath it is difficult to push a pram along without having at times to go into the road. Neither Glaziers Lane nor Westwood Lane were designed for the volume of traffic they currently take, let alone a massive increase that would be generated by developing A46.

Westward Lane has a very narrow railway arch under which the lane passes. This is only one lane wide and is skewed with poor sightline visibility. This also has a height restriction preventing larger vehicles such as buses and lorries from using.

Although unsuitable, both Glaziers Lane and Westward Lane take traffic between A31 Hogs Back and A323 Aldershot/Guildford Road particularly at peak times. Whenever there are traffic problems on A31 or A323, (with increasing frequency), traffic diverts through Normandy causing traffic chaos.

The proposed development of site A46 would create a massive increase in vehicle movements on a daily basis throughout the day. The vehicle movements and parking of parent's cars because of the very large school would be massive and should not be underestimated. Traffic chaos would prevail and also the problems caused by hundreds of parked cars due to parents taking and collecting children at the school.

Most children would not be able to come by rail (the station platforms are only long enough for 4 carriages) and these are usually full of passengers in the mornings and evenings. It would not be safe or possible to bus hundreds of children in and out of school each day either - the number of coaches required on these narrow busy roads would be dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Much of the land proposed for development is also prone to frequent flooding. These are clearly valid objections in the eyes of those who know the area. For these reasons, I strongly urge for the Local Plan to be rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11958  Respondent: 10840129 / Roy Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. Infrastructure already overloaded

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/872  Respondent: 10840161 / Janet Attfield  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

If smaller homes are built with small plot sizes then there will be more congestion. There will be more pressure on the local infrastructure. Our schools are already full and services stretched. There are not enough Police to care for the proposed influx of people. There will be more pollution and less countryside for those families to enjoy. The proposed building expansion is unsustainable.

I consider myself very lucky to live in the Guildford area. As your proposed planning document states we have low unemployment. It has a character of its own and yet is within striking distance of the job opportunities in London, bringing wealth from the city to the surrounding area. If the village flavour of the Horsleys and surrounding settlements are changed, then those people sustaining Guildford, will go elsewhere.

The Borough Council should be proud of the environment they have created. I urge you not to spoil the character and sense of community that Surrey has worked hard to achieve. As Joni Mitchell sings in her song 'Big Yellow Taxi'- 'You don't know what you've got till it's gone'.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13849  Respondent: 10843233 / David Hardiman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am not aware of anyone in this county, let alone this nation, who voted for destroying the Green Belt. We already live in one of the most overcrowded parts of the country. Roads are congested, schools are full to capacity and hospital waiting times are a joke. Just to drive out of our village in the morning can take up to 15 minutes to cover a few hundred metres. This is stressful and will only get far worse with more houses, particularly on the scale proposed.

Further housebuilding will not only worsen an already congested road network, but the overcrowding will create further pressure on schools, hospitals, and other services. What is GBC doing to consider the wellbeing of their constituents?

High volumes of traffic and congestion have obvious negative effects. These include road collisions, the severance of communities, the costs of delays and the unreliability of journey times to people and businesses. Environmental and health impacts include traffic noise, air pollution and amenity issues. Some parts of the major roads in Surrey (including those around the Horsleys) operate significantly beyond their capacity, resulting in traffic congestion, and forcing drivers down rural / country lanes to avoid main roads, leading to further congestion, road accidents and pollution.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/14901</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10843905 / G King</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery – Object**

**Infrastructure & Services for East and West Horsley**

The local plan proposes an huge increase in the number of houses is the Horsleys yet no plans on how the local infrastructure will be expanded or improved to accommodate the increase.

There is no mention of how infrastructure is to be funded. There is no plan or details for management of increased traffic in the villages. There is no mention of how the water drainage and the foul drainage system infrastructure will be upgraded to cope with the increase demand placed on these services.

Specific existing issues which this plan will exacerbate include:

- There is only a very limited bus service and no buses at weekends.
- It is difficult to get a Doctor’s appointment at the Medical Centre in East Horsley, it can be a 2 week wait. The walk-in clinic where appointments are released on the day starts to queue before 8.00am in the morning for 8.30am surgery opening time.
- The junction of Ockham Road North and Kingston Avenue, the location of East Horsley Medical Centre, is already difficult to negotiate.
- Parking is full every weekday at Horsley and Effingham stations.
- Ockham Road North between Horsley Station and East Lane is repeatedly flooded in moderate rainfall. Pedestrians are forced to take cover in driveways. Converting land to housing will exacerbate this issue
- East Lane between Edwin Close on Long Reach repeatedly floods in moderate rainfall.
- The Raleigh School does not have enough places to meet the current demands. No plans have been published for creating further school places for children of all ages in the Horsleys. The traffic in out of all of the schools in the immediate area causes a lot of congestion. Parked cars for events at Glenesk School cause a lot of parking and traffic problems on East Lane.
- West Horsley will have no facilities, the small village shop is about to close. The Post Office closed a few years ago and is now housing. Presumably GBC regard this as a success according to the proposals in this plan.
• The number of houses proposed and the increase in size of the village is out of character with the rural landscape. The density of housing on the proposed sites is very high and not in keeping with the rest of the village. West Horsley has a mix of low density housing in roads and streets off East Lane and The Street, these have been added gradually and sympathetically over the decades. West Horsley is defined by its openness of hedgerows and agricultural land with a number of historic buildings.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6930  Respondent: 10844353 / Julia Wood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan on the following grounds:

1) I object to the building of the enormous number of houses being built in Ripley, Send and Clandon. These communities do not need such over development. The infrastructure cannot cope with such a development. The development should be in urban areas with adequate transport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6386  Respondent: 10845377 / Natasha Lock  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Pollution:

The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough

Schools:

Local schools are already at capacity – where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project.

There is talk of a new school at a site near to Lollesworth lane west Horsley, but this should have been talked about well before the local plan went out for consultation.

Medical facilities:

Already very difficult to get an appointment and the car park is always full

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1.1 I object to policy I1 “Infrastructure and delivery” on the grounds that;

1.2 Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

1.3 The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

1.4 The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

1.5 Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.

1.6 This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

1.7 The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints.

1.8 The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model.

1.9 Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods.

1.10 Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan.

1.11 The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Juncions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to
capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion \textit{will be worse than it is today on much of the network.}

1.12 It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below.

1.13 In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5...indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’.

1.14 The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”.

1.15 Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided.

1.16 The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR:

1.16.1 Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road /Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3)

1.16.2 Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/ B2234 roundabout ( paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8).

1.16.3 Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14)

1.16.4 Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction.

1.16.5 Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction).

1.16.6 Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane.
1.16.7 Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

1.17 The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen.

1.18 The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan and consequently congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/1114  Respondent: 10846625 / Frank Drennan  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )


I object to ASP 3 new A3/A3100/B2215/A247 Burpham-Burnt common all-movements junction, formed by a new connector road linking between new A3/A3100 Burpham junction (SRN4) and the B2215 London Road, in combination with the new A3 northbound on-slip (SRN9) and the new A3 southbound off-slip (SRN10) under Infrastructure and Delivery.

If development gets the go ahead for the strategic site at Gosden Hill it would be logical to construct a 4-way A3 interchange at Burpham. It is not feasible to pass the problem down the line to Send which will already be bearing the brunt of traffic generated from a planned 4,000 homes. The A247 link road to Woking already at capacity will become gridlocked.

I object to SRN4 New A3/A3100 Burpham junction with relocated A3 southbound off-slip and new A3 southbound on-slip. This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 whereby traffic will be passing directly through Send from the A3 and M25 and the proposed new development at Wisley.

I object to SRN9 A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common) and SRN10 A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common). This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 which is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1778  Respondent: 10848513 / Martin Cole  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
11. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors, hospitals etc. are already at capacity. It is already extremely difficult to get a GP appointment in the local surgeries without a long wait.

Are there plans to improve the capability of the emergency services, police, ambulance, fire brigade to cover the extra houses in the north east of the borough?

I wish my objections to be taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/808  Respondent: 10848705 / John Woodcock  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of provision for Doctors’ Surgeries. The existing Surgeries are already full and quick appointments or consultations are very difficult if not impossible to arrange, even for the very ill. Adding more demand without more provision is reckless and risks serious damage to residents’ health and well-being.

2. I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools. We live in an affluent area of a relatively affluent Country. We should be educating our children to the highest standards and we need to make school as inclusive to all as possible. Over-crowded schools are a catalyst for unrest and lead to disenfranchised and disenchanted children, with undue pressure on over-worked teaching staff and a knock-on negative effect on families and communities. We need to make more places available, not “shoe-horn” more children into the same schools

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5668  Respondent: 10851201 / Jon Woollard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Schools and Medical facilities.

As you must know, our schools are full and our Medical Centre stretched. You are making no promises that new schools are to be built, so I am assuming children living in all these new houses will have to travel out of the area to attend other schools. Not ideal in any way, and that means more traffic on the roads, and speeding through the village on our narrow roads, already a problem.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/17194  Respondent: 10851201 / Jon Woollard  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The proposed developments in East Horsley, West Horsley and Ockham area represent a very significant increase in the number of homes given a total over-estimation of the real population growth projections and housing needs. Development at this scale will irrevocably change our Villages and cause considerable adverse effects on traffic, parking at local shops and railway stations, access to local school places, the medical facility and access to doctors. I do not think that the Local Plan provides a rational and fair basis for allocating housing to East Horsley, providing the required infrastructure improvements, or protecting East Horsley’s Green Belt and Village classification. It is not in the interests of East Horsley residents and I will help fight it all the way through the courts if needed until changed. I object in the strongest terms to these Local Plan proposals.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/251  Respondent: 10851457 / Sue Hook  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes. Our roads are already busy and parking is limited. This includes parking at the railway station, and at the local shops where it is very often difficult to find a space. Our roads are frequently flooded in bad weather too, which could only be made worse by more pressure on the drainage system that so many new houses would undoubtedly cause.

The only medical practice is in East Horsley, serving both East and West Horsley as well as surrounding areas. It is an extremely busy practice and it can often be difficult to get an appointment. With the proposed increase in population this medical practice would be stretched even further.

This leads me on to mention the state schools in our area. The local primary and secondary schools, the Raleigh and the Howard, are very good and very popular. There have been times where children living in the village have been unable to get a place there. This is already a big problem for local families, and we really do not have capacity in our existing schools to cope with the number of families that the proposed housing would bring to the village.

In conclusion, I ask Guildford Borough Council to revise the housing number, and to amend the Local Plan to maintain our existing village boundaries and green belt status.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/4265  Respondent: 10851585 / Mike Coope-Mitchell  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes.

Our roads are already busy and parking is limited. This includes parking at the railway station, and at the local shops where it is very often difficult to find a space. Our roads are frequently flooded in bad weather too, which could only be made worse by more pressure on the drainage system that so many new houses would undoubtedly cause.

The only medical practice is in East Horsley, serving both East and West Horsley as well as surrounding areas. It is an extremely busy practice and it can often be difficult to get an appointment. With the proposed increase in population this medical practice would be stretched even further.

This leads me on to mention the state schools in our area. The local primary and secondary schools, the Raleigh and the Howard, are very good and very popular. There have been times where children living in the village have been unable to get a place there. This is already a big problem for local families, and we really do not have capacity in our existing schools to cope with the number of families that the proposed housing would bring to the village.

In conclusion, I ask Guildford Borough Council to revise the housing number, and to amend the Local Plan to maintain our existing village boundaries and green belt status.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7838</th>
<th>Respondent: 10852289 / Barry Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the fact that the infrastructure has not been considered and is inadequate to deal with the proposed housing levels and additional traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9800</th>
<th>Respondent: 10853249 / Evan Parry-Morris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local healthcare facilities overwhelmed

Many local health services, such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send, are being stretched already, and it’s becoming more difficult to get doctor/nurse appointments without unacceptable delays. This would become significantly worse should the draft local plan be implemented. I object to the additional stress that would be caused should the proposals be implemented.

Lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites

Local infrastructure is already stretched, and there appears little or no planning or implementation of improvements prior to the proposed plan. This is particularly true at Garlick’s Arch. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning of local services such as doctors and schools.

Sites planned in unsustainable locations

Many strategic sites, such as Garlick’s Arch and Wisley Airfield, are in unsustainable locations. They are not located near any railway stations, and would not be within easy reach of local villages. With infrequent bus services, residents would be reliant on the use of motor vehicles resulting in further pollution and congestion. I object on the grounds of the sites being unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/8495  **Respondent:** 10853857 / Norman Kidd  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Whilst School Places do not affect me personally and others are probably more qualified to speak on the subject. As I understand it many did not get their children in to their first choice of St Bede's, these developments will just make it harder which will mean more traffic on the roads for school runs.

What does affect me is the inability to get a doctors appointment in a reasonable time at the Villages Medical Centre - these developments will add to that pressure, without I would imagine more resources being made available

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/7177  **Respondent:** 10854113 / Sarah Pickering  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

WE OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

WE OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing Greenfield over urban, Brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of house building as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean NO development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
3. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2173  Respondent: 10855553 / Emma Tallick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/624  Respondent: 10857777 / Ian Gray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the complete lack of provisions on the infrastructure need: Schools, Doctor surgeries, play fields etc

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8367  Respondent: 10856513 / Janet Kidd  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
What affects me is the inability to get a doctor's appointment in a reasonable time at the Villages Medical Centre now—these developments will add to that pressure, without I would imagine more resources being made available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1108  Respondent: 10857217 / Mark Sherwood  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to lodge my objection to the Proposed Local Plan.

I object on the following grounds:

Education. The Raleigh already operates at full capacity with no land to expand into. Places are in demand and extra housing means even more demand. Where would those children go to school and what of the others who would usually fall into the catchment area? Would that shrink to accommodate the increased demand? Furthermore, Surrey County Council has no plans to build new schools in the area.

Roads. The roads in the villages are busy and sometimes dangerous. There's already many housing works taking place with vans and lorries delivering and construction blocking or reducing access. Part of the beauty of the villages is that it's commutable distance to many places of work but isolated enough to have a countryside feel to it. Don't take that away.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14648  Respondent: 10857249 / Alice Pashley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even
more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past
through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be
an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will
result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents,
noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one
side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant
Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to
build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment
without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for
enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion -
averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get
worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local
road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway
schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought
buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable
(and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s
infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however,
assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically
dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a
key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large
infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing
conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns
over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if
at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been
identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing
residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and
sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages
Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon
existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will
stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7271  Respondent: 10857761 / Daniel & Katy Murphy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Why is that each year I find myself having to write to the council in protest at plans drawn up under your guidance? We live in West Clandon, a beautiful village of historical significance and charm. We use our local facilities and support local businesses in and around the Guildford area, but in order to do this we have to work in areas other than Guildford as there is simply not the infrastructure in our local area to provide jobs for the current level of housing (or suitable, reliable transport links in and out of Guildford), let alone an aggressively expanded plan which you are putting forth once again.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8870  Respondent: 10857889 / William Kyte OBE  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT to this policy as it stands

Various aspects of infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth.

The methodology commissioned by the Council to assess traffic and the corresponding roads infrastructure needs is inadequate for the purpose of the Local Plan.

With regard to SANG provision, GBC has demonstrated that it has no genuine interest in conserving and enhancing biodiversity and clearly regards the Thames Basin Heaths SPA as an obstacle to be overcome rather than a valued asset. GBC is failing to take account of existing biodiversity at sites selected for SANG provision.

Areas identified as SANGS should not be developed and urbanised.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7849  Respondent: 10858625 / Susan Tyzack  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to inform you of our objections to the New Local Plan 2016, especially in relation to the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield and also to the proposals for more than 500 new homes in East and West Horsley. We believe that these proposals, which would remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt, are a significant over-development and would totally swamp an already overloaded infrastructure - I've had my wing mirror knocked more than once at the Ockham Road South 'pinch-point', heaven help us if it has to withstand the traffic required to construct an entire new town!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/663</th>
<th>Respondent: 10858657 / Fiona Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the increase in traffic these proposals will have on the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the complete lack of provisions on the infrastructure need: Schools, Doctor Surgeries, playing fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11657</th>
<th>Respondent: 10858753 / Carole Warren</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the plan on the grounds of insufficient infrastructure around local services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan fails to identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local services such as Doctors, Dentists, Nurseries, Primary and Secondary Schools are all operating at capacity, or close to capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Sewerage, Rain Floodaways, Increased road and rail usage, all need to be accounted for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact on Police and other Emergency services and access routes need to be considered, but there are inadequate plans to meet these demands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Horsley there is just the single Doctors Surgery, and organising an appointment is currently very difficult, so further households will stretch these services to breaking point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery

Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.

This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints.

The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model.

Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods.

Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan.

The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow
becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network.

It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below.

In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5...indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’.

The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”.

Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided.

The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR:

- **Blackwell Farm** – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road / Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3)
- **Gosden Hill Farm** – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/ B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8).
- **Wisley** – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14)
- **Normandy/Flexford** – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7).
- **Tables 4.10 and 4.11** show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction.
- **Ash** – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction).
- **Slyfield** – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane.
- **Town Centre** – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.
The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen.

The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. **Congestion will worsen.** The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3497  Respondent: 10859265 / Neil Haxton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7) I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5734  Respondent: 10859489 / Jennifer Procter  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

ROADS, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

I object to the lack of any solid proposals for roads to support any of the developments. Proper highway surveys have not been undertaken and the majority of stated potential undertakings are no more than aspirational at best and unachievable at worst. I do not believe such major structural requirements should be so ignored or again, handed as conditions to developers. It is not enough insurance and gives developers a potential free hand to begin housebuilding without these being in place. The result will be chaos.

I object to the fact that in its entirety this Draft Local Plan ignores the huge problems that will be generated throughout the Borough on the road networks and hubs, as well as through villages and on country roads.

I object that insufficient consideration has been given to the problems which will arise from pressure on public services, sewerage etc.
I object that not enough attention is paid to environmental aspects, particularly air quality which is poor currently and will be made a great deal worse as a result of increased traffic.

I object that there are misleading and incorrect references to bus timetables and services for the villages. These have been made to appear much more efficient than they actually are.

I object that there are references to increasing use of cycling as a means of transport when the lack of provision of cycle paths and the impossibility of providing them along tortuous, unlit narrow roads often bearing heavy traffic makes this a nonsense.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9772  Respondent: 10859489 / Jennifer Procter  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

ROADS, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

I object to the lack of any solid proposals for roads to support any of the developments. Proper highway surveys have not been undertaken and the majority of stated potential undertakings are no more than aspirational at best and unachievable at worst. I do not believe such major structural requirements should be so ignored or again, handed as conditions to developers. It is not enough insurance and gives developers a potential free hand to begin housebuilding without these being in place. The result will be chaos.

I object to the fact that in its entirety this Draft Local Plan ignores the huge problems that will be generated throughout the Borough on the road networks and hubs, as well as through villages and on country roads.

I object that insufficient consideration has been given to the problems which will arise from pressure on public services, sewerage etc.

I object that not enough attention is paid to environmental aspects, particularly air quality which is poor currently and will be made a great deal worse as a result of increased traffic.

I object that there are misleading and incorrect references to bus timetables and services for the villages. These have been made to appear much more efficient than they actually are.

I object that there are references to increasing use of cycling as a means of transport when the lack of provision of cycle paths and the impossibility of providing them along tortuous, unlit narrow roads often bearing heavy traffic makes this a nonsense.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16041  Respondent: 10859553 / MARK Curtis  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICY II INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY

I object to policy II Infrastructure and delivery

Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem.

The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.

This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceeding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable.

The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints.

The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model.

Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods.

Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan.

The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be
at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network.

It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below.

In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario 5..indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton.

The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”.

Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided.

The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR:

Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road /Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3)

Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8).

Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14)

Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction.

Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction).
Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane.

Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3579  Respondent: 10859585 / Irene Grainger   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the number of homes that the Plan intends to deliver as this will be unacceptable as our local schools are already over subscribed, it is already extremely difficult to get a doctors appointment now without any extra people coming to our village!

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that Send Hill is a single track country road and too narrow to provide sufficient access to the site or accommodate the potential new levels of traffic the proposed development would bring.

I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that the existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate and would certainly be made worse with the planned development. The number of heavy lorries using Potters Lane is already a grave danger to the residents but nothing has been done to alleviate this problem and now the planners want to make the situation much worse by their proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1123  Respondent: 10860481 / Edith Cain   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
I am writing yet again about the plan for more building of houses in these villages. Has anyone given any real thought about the infrastructure?

The roads are already in a bad state of repair, parking is very limited both in the village and at Bishopsmead. The schools are full as is the doctors’ surgery. How can extra homes be accommodated?

As for the proposed building at Wisley Airfield. Do you know it is a flood plain? Also that part of the A 3 is very congested with the run in to the A 25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13528  **Respondent:** 10861089 / Philip Homewood  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The village,s are at full capacity at the moment and the original Infrastructure road,s car park,s drainage school,s and medical facilities will not be able to cope with proposed expansion

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/437  **Respondent:** 10863937 / Monica Pashley  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the lack of consideration to the amount of traffic this will create – Ripley already has more than it can cope with being grid locked at rush hours already.

I OBJECT TO the amount of pollution the concentration of traffic in a small area will create.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11821  **Respondent:** 10863969 / Joanne Rooke  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11833</th>
<th>Respondent: 10863969 / Joanne Rooke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5026</th>
<th>Respondent: 10864353 / Eildert Jan Panman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Infrastructure Policy I1, I2 and 13 because they are inadequate to the needs of housing expansion in the Horsleys. The local lanes are narrow and winding, poorly drained and lit with narrow or no pavements. Ockham Road North and South is too narrow for the ever increasing number of enormous trucks using it and has the constraint of the narrow, arched railway bridge that regularly suffers vehicle strikes. The Medical Centre runs to capacity and so do local schools. The station car parks are full every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1605</th>
<th>Respondent: 10865537 / Edwina Fassom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10905</th>
<th>Respondent: 10866721 / Andy Court</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to strongly object to the proposal to build residential properties at the Thatchers hotel site, the Ockham Road North and South sites and Manor Farm/East Lane West Horsley. East and West Horsley are lovely small villages but with limited infrastructure. Shops Schools medical facilities are already overwhelmed and the road network already sees long queues at the village junctions with the Guildford/Epsom Road during the morning and evening rush hour. These proposals will destroy the Horsleys and must be rejected. The recent referendum has shown how dissatisfied people are with the political elite who have shown no understanding of the anger communities feel when they see their village/town taken away from them by forcing population growth. Guildford should take heed and take measures to protect its lovely villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10910</th>
<th>Respondent: 10866721 / Andy Court</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the latest plan to remove our greenbelt for development. I was going to highlight all my concerns but after seeing the Ripley action groups website their specific points say it all. I do not understand why councils/government do not look to build more towns well away from existing villages/towns as they did years ago with Milton Keynes. Building within existing villages totally over runs them and there are never amenities put in place to cope with schooling, doctors surgeries and traffic management. If there is an incident on either the A3 or the M25 it becomes totally gridlocked in Send Marsh/Send/Ripley as all the A3 traffic comes off and through Ripley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT STRONGLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10910</th>
<th>Respondent: 10866721 / Andy Court</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites  
I object to the lack of planning and implementation of infrastructure. For example at Garlick’s Arch. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ quality of life will significantly deteriorate in many ways. How will the local services such as doctors and schools cope? |
| Lack of Utilities Capacity  
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. I object to the development of Garlick’s Arch on the ground that there is little capacity in these networks. |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
## Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object due to the further stress it will put upon existing health services.

## Local policing facilities will be overwhelmed
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the likes of Garlick’s Arch and Wisley Airfield will stretch the police services further and I object.

## Local social welfare facilities will be overwhelmed

## Local shops/restaurant facilities will be overwhelmed

### What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

#### Attached documents:

## Lack of proper pedestrian footpaths on local roads

### What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

#### Attached documents:

## I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

### What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

#### Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13454</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10867009 / Paul Good</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13535</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10867137 / Richard Moore</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object that little attention has been paid to infrastructure.

I object to all the additional houses when the local schools are already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/993</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10868609 / Robert Lockie</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the lack of provision for new schools.
2. I object to the lack of provision Doctors Surgeries.
3. I object to the lack of thought regarding congestion on the already congested roads.
4. I object to the lack of thought regarding general infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11679</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10868609 / Robert Lockie</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11690</td>
<td>Respondent: 10868609 / Robert Lockie</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the wholesale developments proposed in the local plan. With the developments proposed for Wisley (A35), Garlick’s Arch, Gosden Farm (A25) and Blackwell Farm there would be ribbon development along the A3 which would overload the surrounding area infrastructure and nature of the villages, especially as there is no firm evidence that this amount of development is needed and there IS evidence that this development is not needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11691</th>
<th>Respondent: 10868609 / Robert Lockie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object because the transport assessment for Send and the surrounding area was not available to councillors for the vote taken on 24th May (the vote to put forward the local plan for consultation) I object to the proposed developments in Send as there is no provision for school place: the merger of Send infant and junior school in Send to the new building which should be ready in December 2016 has no provision for increased numbers of children which the extensive proposed building in Send would require</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/203</th>
<th>Respondent: 10869633 / John &amp; Jacquie Sharman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am also objecting to the development of Wisley airfield.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe that the developments would create very congested roads. There would be too much pressure on services such as the medical centre. There would not be enough car parking spaces at the station or shops. There would be greater risk of flooding. There would be much higher levels of pollution. There would be a lack of school places in the area. Finally it would be dreadful to destroy our beautiful countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9784  Respondent: 10871329 / Lyn Gargan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object that the present infrastructure and is lack of ability to cope with the people who are already resident here and that this has not been addressed. Our doctors, The Villages Medical Centre, is over stretched as it is. The local schooling is not able to accommodate the children who live within a reasonable distance to access their education within their community.

I cannot see that this local plan addresses this and that there is perhaps another agenda that us, as local residents are not party to.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5376  Respondent: 10872001 / Allanah Morris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Concerns

West Horsley is a rural community. The plan almost doubling the amounts of housing would cause the destruction of the character of the village putting intolerable stress on the local infrastructure. Already schools and Gp's struggle with servicing the community

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11696  Respondent: 10872545 / David and Rachel Price  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The local infrastructure just cannot cope with any more housing or retail development in the area on this scale. There is a severe drainage issue in this area, with standing water already making driving hazardous during wet weather. The various schools in the area generate high levels of traffic, and the route through the villages have become rat runs from the A3 to the A246 and beyond. Try making a right turn out of Ockham Road South onto the A246 during rush hour. It’s a serious accident waiting to happen with cars attempting to use the driveway of the Duke of Wellington pub as a cut through to avoid the mounting queues of waiting cars. The proximity to the petrol station also situated on that junction makes it an extremely dangerous manoeuver. Increased traffic from more housing, and more businesses will be intolerable for the community. The local schools are stretched to bursting point and the doctors’ surgery is also overloaded and there doesn’t seem to be any mention in the local plan of improving these vital services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

• Nowhere in the plan is there any provision for any additional infrastructure. With 533 houses, based on current demographics, will mean a huge leap in demand for public services which cannot cope. These will include:
  ◦ No singular development is large enough to ensure the developers invest in any of the infrastructure of the area.
  ◦ Schools place both Primary and Senior: If 50% have 2 children, where are the 533 additional school places going to be when the schools are already heavily oversubscribed?
  ◦ Transport and parking: If 20% of homes have a commuter to London (106 people), where are they going to park? There is no room at the station car park. There is one bus every two hours!
  ◦ Drainage: Although an element of investment has been made to improve drainage in West Horsley the roads still flood. The already fragile drainage just will not cope and we will have road closures for weeks again into the village.
  ◦ Roads: The roads in the village are not build to carry more traffic, a 20% plus increase in traffic will not only lead to significant congestion but damage to the environment.
  ◦ Lighting: There are approx. 235 new homes planned for on or just off East Lane, with the increased proportion of children in to the area the roads will be highly unsafe as there is no street lighting and completely inadequate foot paths.
  ◦ Medical: The doctors surgery is already bursting at the seams, if the mix of older people and families, as I would expect, moving to the new homes this is going to going to result in much more than 20% increase in patients.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• The Ockham development with 2000+ homes is almost going to double the number of homes, while there has been limited mention of infrastructure, this has not extended to the impact on road and load public transport network etc.

No responsible decision can be taken with a view to such unwanted expansion of the village without out addressing satisfactorily the above issues. They are too important to be brushed over and ignored.

I trust that you will take my views and that of the other local residents into serious consideration when finalising the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6929  Respondent: 10872961 / Liz Cass  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There are significant shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it stands today and the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in this Document will exacerbate this problem.

The local infrastructure is not set up to deal with significant population growth and additional housing. Current examples in East and West Horsley include:

1. Through roads already very busy at peak times, have multiple pot holes, and have pavements which are either very narrow, do not exist at all, or are in extremely poor condition. This makes the village unsuitable for high volumes of any kind of traffic, let alone the volume of HGVs now using it. As a mother of 3 young children using the pavements daily to walk to school, it is unfortunately only a matter of time before the deteriorating traffic, road and pavement combination will result in a serious incident.

2. Drainage system already very prone to overflows, eg, on Ockham Road North from the railway bridge to the junction with East Lane, every time there is heavy rain, resulting in the road becoming akin to a river. Road repairs last year have done absolutely nothing to alleviate the problem.

3. Schools already significantly over-subscribed with local children

4. Limited bus service.

5. Train service to London already very busy. Additional commuters would make it likely that not everyone getting on at Horsley station at peak time would get a seat, despite the journey being 50 mins into London Waterloo.

There are no proposals in respect of any of the existing problems with roads, pavements, drainage, transport and schools.

It is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley and in West Horsley and Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. The failure to address the serious inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious omission in GBC’s Document.

Furthermore, and as I also described in my comments about removing East Horsley from the Green Belt, East Horsley is an attractive village for people wishing to relocate from more built up areas, due its village feel. That includes the village school, The Raleigh. Our family, and many of our friends chose to move to Horsley precisely because of the primary school, which manages to retain a village feel, yet is of ample size to provide the facilities required for children from Reception – Year 6. The existing school would not be able to cater for an increase in demand, and unless we wish to remove the current attractiveness of this village school, nor should we consider an increase in the numbers.

I therefore object to the infrastructure proposals contained in GBC’s Document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Finally... overall I am utterly frustrated at a Council which should be protecting the local areas from inappropriate development which seems to have lost site of its duty and is trying to achieve new housing in the area at the detriment of the locals, with no regard to the over burdened infrastructure and all to achieve some target imagined up as being needed by someone and seeing these little villages as the place to damage to achieve it.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
All of the above would impact Send's infrastructure significantly. This infrastructure is already fully maximised. We are already experiencing traffic congestion daily through Send and surrounding areas. Schools would be impacted, schools that have limited places already. The Villages Medical Centre is already extremely busy with about 2 weeks notice needed to book appointments with GPs.

Any additional housing on this scale will increase road congestion, the impact on schools and the surrounding medical facilities. All social care facilities would be impacted.

This proposal would increase pollution and noise which is already substantial from the A3. Reduce our country side and influence and impact its inhabitants significantly. We are trying to teach everyone, including our children, to preserve the environment, help reduce pollution and not to increase the impact on our greenbelt. This housing proposal would have the opposite effect.

I am a resident near the Burnt Common roundabout and drive through Burnt Common several time a day. It is congested, busy, any additional traffic would make the situation much worse and impact our village negatively. Garlick's Arch and the woodland surroundings serve as a buffer to the A3, removal would bring the A3 into the village, there is no benefit from this for local residents. We do not want more traffic, noise, pollution. We live in a village because we want to be surrounded by countryside. Countryside that has been there for hundreds of years and should be enjoyed by many generations to come.

I object in the strongest possible way to the above policies, the additional housing proposed in Burnt Common, Garlick's Arch, Send Hill and Winds Ridge and the removal of Send from greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

The Plan has huge deficiencies in infrastructure provision and investment, particularly in transport. The proposed provision of more than 12,000 homes will put undue pressure on already crowded roads, schools and medical facilities. How can a relatively small, northern part of Surrey absorb some 40,000 new inhabitants without causing chaos and ruining the character of the neighbourhoods? Add in the thousands and thousands of extra inhabitants in all the other northern Surrey boroughs, as proposed in other Local Plans, and the whole area will be completely swamped, overdeveloped and snarled with traffic, making it just an extension of urbanised Greater London. It is irrational to look at one borough as if it were an island and ask it to design a Plan for what it sees as its needs without considering the impact of demands and pressures from all surrounding areas and vice versa. Consider in full the impacts, for example, on the A3 and M25. That is why the entire Local Plan exercise is so fundamentally flawed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPP16/139  Respondent: 10876961 / Geoffrey Willot  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have to express my views on the plan because, as a long time resident in Horsley, I believe the proposals would, if implemented, have a terrible effect on the villages. The villages could not cope with the effect on roads, schools, medical services and, I suspect, water supplies and drainage, unless they were expanded greatly. Even more important for me would be the impact on the rural environment and wildlife. The number of houses is inappropriate for the village communities. We have had 'in fill' for years and have managed to absorb and welcome these homes and new people but further expansion, especially on this scale, would change the villages enormously for the worse and so I must express my strong opposition to the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18479  Respondent: 10877025 / Maureen Stephens  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16707  Respondent: 10877057 / Jennifer Dodd  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3) The magnitude of the proposed increase in the Horsleys housing would create unacceptable density in the area with irreversible environmental destruction and a major impact on the local infrastructure.

4) Without major investment to expand our medical, educational, parking and drainage facilities these villages risk being overwhelmed by the influx of vehicles and people. Our local roads are already over used and dangerous in places.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
None of these proposals are in the best interests of Send and its residents and any change to its Green Belt status would greatly diminish the character and identity of the village. In addition, the general strain on the infrastructure of the village in terms of roads, schooling and medical services would be overwhelming. Already in Send, traffic is heavy at certain times of day, schools over-subscribed and The Villages Medical Centre struggles to provide timely appointments for the residents currently registered.

I trust these objections are received and noted in accordance with procedure and look forward to news arising from the reassessment which will surely be necessary once the full extent of the resistance of local residents to the Local Plan proposals is known to GBC.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3696</th>
<th>Respondent: Millie Lipscombe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The existing infrastructure is already tremendously overloaded particularly where schools, medical facilities, roads and parking are concerned. With your proposals, there will be such a complete overload of the infrastructure. There is no room for appreciable increased traffic flow – how do you think anything is going to function with your proposals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Provision for another full Village

The facilities in East Horsley village are getting very stretched and there is no room to expand. Provision must be made for a purpose built “village” area with its own shops including its own medical centre, Village Hall, Schools (nursery as well as primary), Creche/Day Care facilities youth centre, etc. There is now only Lloyds Bank in East Horsley - the only bank in the Village with an ATM.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3925  Respondent: 10877409 / Peter Lipscombe  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- We are currently experiencing problems with flooding roads, much drainage problems and sewage overflow arising as a result. With the proposed increased building, this will exacerbate the flooding, drainage and sewage problems even more.

- The schools, medical facilities, shops and parking are already operating at full capacity. How do you propose the place will function with your proposed addition of over 600 houses in the next five years? It is just simply not sustainable.

- Horsley railway station car park is full most of the time on weekdays – where are commuters going to park? In this connection, you need to take into account the proposed increased number of people living in Ockham and the Horsleys as well. It is no point increasing the housing in the area if people cannot get to work in an efficient manner.

- The roads in the area have considerable difficulty accommodating the Repton local bus service because the roads are narrow and there is no room to widen the roads either. Traffic constantly comes to a halt to allow the Repton bus to get through. This is particularly bad when the school rush hour is also on at the same time.

- East Horsley Medical Centre is already operating at full capacity. We have to wait days and sometimes even a fortnight to get an appointment to see a doctor. The car park for the surgery is frequently operating at full capacity during full surgery hours.

There is inadequate state primary and secondary school places to accommodate children resulting in many children having to travel distances. This adds significantly to the traffic problems in the area during the school rush hour.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4330  Respondent: 10877697 / Derek Howorth  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7953</th>
<th>Respondent: 10877953 / Stephen Day</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local infrastructure is already seriously overloaded with schools full, medical facilities seriously stretched and inadequate parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/115</th>
<th>Respondent: 10878273 / Charlene Taylor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The density of proposed additional housing in East and West Horsley. To add 593 houses to already overcrowded schools, medical facilities and the railway will have a major negative impact on the daily life of local residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5087</th>
<th>Respondent: 10878433 / John Townsend</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to say that the following points as I am concerned that the local plan will destroy our villages. As a resident in Ripley I am very concerned about the extra traffic that will use the already very congested roads, the lack of schools for our children as we already lack that and the fact that our village will no longer feel like a nice small community which is the reason we moved here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of evidence for the alleged housing need numbers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of provision for new schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of provision for doctors surgeries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do strongly support The Ripley Action group and hope we succeed in our cause to ensure our villages and green belts are protected from over building and development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time; particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11016</th>
<th>Respondent: 10878977 / Lisbet Hjort Jensen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2378</th>
<th>Respondent: 10880257 / Carolyn Whitfield</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy P1)

I have been a resident in Ripley since 2010 and the weight of traffic has dramatically increased. I am a cyclist so notice this first hand.

At a time of reduced bus services through Ripley and no train stations nearby the cars from the extra houses will clog the already busy roads as the local transport facilities are already inadequate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16530</th>
<th>Respondent: 10880609 / S. Groves</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered at any point in this proposed Local Plan, and are inadequate to deal with proposed increase in housing levels. Roads, public transport, availability at doctor’s surgery and places within schools will be unable to cope with the increase in housing and population.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9804</th>
<th>Respondent: 10880993 / Roger Knee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to there being no immediate provision for: -

New schools
More GP services
How will RSC cope?

Highways will be totally inadequate and local areas will become gridlocked during the rush hours and virtually all day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5216   Respondent: 10881569 / Nicola Douet   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The expansion of West Horsley village is unsustainable. There is only one small shop, no post office and a sparse week day only bus service through the village which would not be sufficient to serve the high volumes of housing being proposed. The development of nearly 400 homes (an increase of 35% on the current number of dwellings) on the 4 proposed sites are at a far higher density than currently exist. No sound reasons have been given for the proposed changes to the settlement boundaries, which appear to be aimed solely at increasing the land available for additional development.

Public Transport: Horsley rail station is a very busy station. The car park is usually full on week days; unless it is expanded it will not support such a large increase in vehicles. There would also be increased traffic to & from the station to drop off & pick up travellers including school children going to Guildford and Leatherhead. At an exhibition about the proposed development of Wisley airfield I was told that there were no plans to increase the car park capacity at Horsley station.

Schools: What is the estimated increase in the number of school places? Any provision for additional places must be in place before any houses are built. Surrey County Council has a statutory duty to ensure appropriate school commissioning and provision. The Raleigh school serves both East and West Horsley and is full every year plus a waiting list. Will the new Howard of Effingham School have greater capacity? If yes, will it meet the needs of the increased population West Horsley? If no, then this needs to be urgently addressed. What consultation has there been between Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council?

Local facilities: (Shops, health services, playgrounds, library, community buildings and spaces) There is one local store in West Horsley and parking for 4-5 vehicles. The shopping area at East Horsley is vibrant, thriving and well used. However, parking can be difficult with the car park often close to capacity. This would only be exacerbated by an increase in traffic and I believe would ultimately put people off shopping there. If people cannot park they will take their custom elsewhere meaning a huge loss of custom to the local businesses.

I am not against all development and I agree that more housing, especially smaller properties and affordable housing is needed but it MUST be in keeping with the locale and not at the cost of the current landscape and community. And the infrastructure needs to be in place before any housing is built.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
17. I object to the impact of further congestion on local village roads and lanes.

18. I object to the impact of excessive development on the A3 and M25 on air quality. The air quality in many parts of the borough is greater than EU permitted levels and will damage the health of residents and future residents.

19. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are designated on Green Belt land along the A3. This will result in gridlock on the A3, the A247 and the surrounding roads which are already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

29. I object to the impact that additional residents will have on local roads, health services, education spaces and policing needs.

30. I object to the failure of Guildford Borough Council to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 in the Local Plan and to find sufficient brownfield sites for development prior to considering sites within the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4277  Respondent: 10884929 / Kim Mackenzie  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We do accept modest development plans, but

I OBJECT MOST STRONGLY TO:

The huge amount of development proposed in the Horsley villages and the neighbouring areas, totally out of proportion to any defined need. Our infrastructure services (transport, schools, medical facilities and social services) are already overloaded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1104  Respondent: 10884993 / Dave Fassom  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow, only being wide enough for one vehicle at a time. The main “pinch point” on The Street in West Clandon is a case in point: lorries travelling in opposite directions cannot pass each other and, when faced with a lorry, even cars need to mount the pavement to get past. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT most vigorously to the development proposed in the local plan which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads leading to further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever more popular pastime, particularly at weekends, with hundreds of cyclists passing through the local villages on their way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow roads surrounding the villages, and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments, there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk of injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements as mentioned above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to, capacity such as the electrical network and sewers. Without plans to improve these services there should be no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send, will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services even further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision made for what will be the necessary increase in capacity of the Royal Surrey Hospital, Guildford. Where is this assessed and how will it be remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/865  Respondent: 10892097 / Steve Whatley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15719  Respondent: 10892161 / Georgina Price  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Infrastructure in Overload

The local infrastructure just cannot cope with any more housing or retail development in the area on this scale. There is a severe drainage issue in this area, with standing water already making driving hazardous during wet weather. The various schools in the area generate high levels of traffic, and the route through the villages have become rat runs from the A3 to the A246 and beyond. Try making a right turn out of Ockham Road South onto the A246 during rush hour. It’s a serious accident waiting to happen with cars attempting to use the driveway of the Duke of Wellington pub as a cut through to avoid the mounting queues of waiting cars. The proximity to the petrol station also situated on that junction makes it an extremely dangerous manoeuvre. Increased traffic from more housing, and more businesses will be intolerable for the community. The local schools are stretched to bursting point and the doctors’ surgery is also overloaded and there doesn’t seem to be any mention in the local plan of improving these vital services.
The Impact of Additional Residential Housing and Population Increase on Local Facilities

I strongly disagree with the premise in the Draft Local Plan that Okham and the Horsleys are a suitable location for a large number of additional new houses. The housing numbers proposed for Guildford Borough are for 13040 homes over 15 years from 2016 to 2031. This number is too high. The number is based on a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which the council required to be amended by the Head of Planning. This amendment has not taken place and therefore the number of new builds proposed in the Draft Local Plan has no basis. I object to Guildford Council proposing a Draft Local Plan on the basis of flawed evidence.

As an inhabitant of West Horsley I know at first hand the existing population pressure on local facilities. The primary school in our neighbourhood (The Raleigh) is oversubscribed, in common with the local secondary school, the Howard of Effingham. Indeed, in spite of being a Horsley resident, I was not able to secure a place for my daughter in either school.

The local medical centre is also filled to capacity. Residents of adjacent villages e.g., Ripley, East and West Glandon also use the centre. As a consequence, new residents to the village are known to register with alternative practices e.g., Bookham. In conclusion, the village services that currently exist in the Horsleys are already filled to capacity and do not have the facilities to accommodate the large number of new residents which would result from the increase in residential housing proposed in the Local Plan.

Impact of Increased Residential Population on Transport

An increase in the number of residents would result in a heavy increase in both construction related traffic and subsequent traffic arising from an increase in local population.

Most residents of the Horsleys work outside the villages. They either commute into London or Guildford by train, or travel by road to places of work and education. There are very few indigenous employment opportunities in the Horsleys. Essentially they are commuter dormitories. The residents of proposed additional housing are unlikely to be employed in the immediate vicinity of the Horsleys. They will therefore join existing commuters travelling either by road or rail. Horsley station car park is already filled to capacity, and there is no option to extend the car parking facilities for the station. The land is not available for expansion. Likewise, at Effingham Junction, there is little land to spare for additional parking facilities. I would conclude, therefore, there is limited potential for additional commuters to park at the local stations and commute by train. I might add, that Horsley station already serves as a rail hub for adjacent villages (e.g., Shere and Ripley), resulting in heavy road usage at peak commuting time. The housing development proposed in the Local Plan will increase the traffic volume through the village, resulting in additional air and noise pollution.

Key road links to the Horsleys focus on the A246, from Leatherhead to Guildford, and additional rural (narrow and winding) roads linking the villages to Ripley, Cobham and the A3/M25. The A246 currently carries a very high volume of commuter traffic at peak periods creating bottle necks and traffic congestion at both the Givons Grove roundabout on the Leatherhead bypass, and the Merrow roundabout on the outskirts of Guildford. The A3 likewise carries a heavy flow of traffic both into Guildford and north to the M25 at peak hours, with stationary traffic a frequent occurrence. The construction of additional housing in a rural area, which by its location and nature, requires inhabitants to travel predominantly by car, will exacerbate an already congested road network. This will clearly have safety implications, as more congested narrow, rural roads will result in a greater frequency of road traffic accidents and undoubtedly loss of life. It will also increase traffic congestion in local employment hotspots such as Guildford, and Leatherhead.
It makes much more sense to redevelop brownfield sites in Guildford and Woking to accommodate additional housing needs. This would have the advantage of providing new residents with the option of using the existing public transport network, or walking or cycling to work or school. They would also have a full range of urban facilities on their doorstep.

In conclusion, I strongly object to the new housing proposals outlined in the Draft Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15497  Respondent: 10894817 / Stephanie Woodford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15503  Respondent: 10894817 / Stephanie Woodford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

DRAINS, WATER SUPPLY, FLOOD RISK, CONGESTION

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes will lead to flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

In conclusion, I must ask you to revise the housing number, and to amend the Local Plan to utilise brownfield land rather than green field sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7822</th>
<th>Respondent: 10896801 / Clare Fluker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Disproportioned number of new houses for local facilities:</strong> I strongly object to the number of new houses proposed within the Horsleys and surrounding villages namely Ripley, Send and Clandon. Within the Horsleys, the schools, doctors and train stations are struggling to cope with the current demand. My family commute to London from Horsley and the trains and car parking are almost at maximum capacity. Assuming that every new house has at least two cars, this means potentially 6000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The impact on the local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley &amp; Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will be affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1326</th>
<th>Respondent: 10897217 / Warren Hogben</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dealing with some of the detail of the current Local Plan my further objections are as follows:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local infrastructure in both the Horsleys is already at or over capacity e.g. schools, surgeries, dentists, water, sewage, drainage, roads etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8110</th>
<th>Respondent: 10897665 / Sue French</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is way too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to GBC trying to foist on Send increased noise and pollution from vastly increased traffic. I also object to GBC making no provision for new doctors' surgeries, no shops or a proper post office, no new schools and no improved bus services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14975  Respondent: 10897953 / Janice Hughes  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE

It would appear that little consideration has been given to such a potentially high level of new development with respect to the impact on local schools, roads, local medical facilities etc. All such services are already stretched. A significant proportion of our local village roads are fairly narrow and traffic builds up regularly. There are problems with the limited choice of local schools and getting an appointment with the doctor at a local clinic is not always easy. So just on this aspect alone, I object to the extent of the potential development in our immediate area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3403  Respondent: 10898625 / James Hampton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2794  Respondent: 10898721 / J Hawkins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
I feel that the current infrastructure and services will not support the proposed scale of development. The Plan states a proposal to increase the number of cycle-lanes whilst people are forced to drive due to insufficient bus services to the outlying villages leading to an increase in the number of cars using the roads, although the Park 'n Rides do help to reduce the traffic into Guildford town centre. I have lived in Surrey for forty years and seen the insidious erosion of the Green Belt. Future development must take increased flood risks seriously and ensure that infrastructure and services are put in place before/alongside developments not afterwards. Smaller, more affordable houses should be built in preference to larger houses, especially on in-fill sites. This would dilute the strain on local areas while truly respecting the villages, Green Belt, landscapes and heritage sites that make the area a desirable location to live in.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Utilities - Burpham

The current utilities, in particular the sewage system, electricity supply and water are already at capacity for the existing residents. I don't believe the size and operation of the sewers in particular have been taken into account. There would be a requirement for significant upgrade, not considered here nor the impact of how such massive sewers would get beneath the A3 and back to the sewage plant on Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I strongly object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for a new hospital. The Royal Surrey hospital already serves a vast length of the A3 road as the next hospital going south is Portsmouth. The Royal Surrey hospital and other major hospitals situated in the county of Surrey are already stretched to the ultimate limits.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for new roads to link local and neighbouring towns. The existing roads are already grid locked not only at peak times but now throughout the day with the slightest incident that brings chaos to the local roads. Junction 10 of the M25 the main hub for Heathrow and Gatwick airports is now regularly at a standstill throughout the day. The proposed 2016 Draft Local Plan would result in many thousands more vehicles (ie cars and commercial vehicles) attempting to get on the M25 at junction 10 and also using the local roads that link towns.
I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for new transport links. With grid locked roads new railway tracks will have to be laid. The London underground system will now need to expand into the Guildford Borough especially with a link to the airports also local towns and neighbouring borough towns as all of the current road structure will become impossible to use.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5295  Respondent: 10900609 / Beverley Gear  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The village school is over-subscribed so has no places for additional pupils. This would mean any additional children in the area would have to go to schools further afield, thus causing even more congestion on the already too busy local roads during rush hour. With all the extra proposed traffic, Send could possibly be gridlocked all day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2923  Respondent: 10900641 / E.J. Mills  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for a new hospital. The Royal Surrey hospital already serves a vast length of the A3 road as the next hospital going south is Portsmouth. The Royal Surrey hospital and other major hospitals situated in the county of Surrey are already stretched to the ultimate limits.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for new roads to link local and neighbouring towns. The existing roads are already grid locked not only at peak times but now throughout the day with the slightest incident that brings chaos to the local roads.

Junction 10 of the M25 the main hub for Heathrow and Gatwick airports is now regularly at a standstill throughout the day. The proposed 2016 Draft Local Plan would result in many thousands more vehicles (ie cars and commercial vehicles) attempting to get on the M25 at junction 10 and also using the local roads that link towns.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for new transport links. With grid locked roads new railway tracks will have to be laid. The London underground system will now need to expand into the Guildford Borough especially with a link to the airports also local towns and neighbouring borough towns as all of the current road structure will become impossible to use.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18172  
Respondent: 10900897 / Mark Timmings  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Again, it appears that no thought has gone into the infrastructure required for this excessive number of properties. The villages of Send and Ripley are already heavily congested during peak times with pollution from excessive traffic and yet you appear to intend to increase this by a massive amount. Schools are already heavily oversubscribed and doctor surgeries require you to know you’re going to be ill before booking an appointments as they’re so busy.

I see no intention for providing better footpath or cycle lanes or anything else to improve existing road systems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5946  
Respondent: 10901761 / L Pike  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The surrounding roads are already gridlocked and could not accommodate the increase in traffic caused by such a large development.

With regard to the building of a new school on the site. There is no proven need for another secondary school in this area. The existing schools still have capacity to take more pupils and would be willing to extend if necessary.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17072  
Respondent: 10902561 / Maureen Ruddock  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Infrastructure already at breaking point. No regard has been given to the infrastructure which is already inadequate to meet the current level of population in the Horsleys, never mind an increased population. The schools are oversubscribed, parking in the village is a nightmare, the Medical Centre is over stretched with big waiting times to get doctors’ appointments, the trains are overcrowded and the roads around the Horsleys are gridlocked at peak times now. The quality of life for those currently living in the Horsleys and for those who move to the new houses proposed will drastically deteriorate if these new housing proposals go ahead.
In summary; The local infrastructure in Send... Our schools are already oversubscribed; our -t doctor's surgery is extremely busy (it can take up to 3 weeks to see your preferred doctor), limited local shops. There is very limited public transport; our roads are already heavily congested, pollution levels are increasing.

Whilst I appreciate there is a need for housing within the borough. Send village has had a number of new houses built recently; currently 23 homes are being built at the old Vision Engineering site, Send Road.

If the population within the borough is to grow by around 20,000 within the plan period we will not need the proposed 13,000 odd houses proposed by GBC in the Local Plan. If you work on the basis of 2.4 persons per home around 8000 houses would be needed. Could not a large percentage of these houses be built on brownfield sites? Perhaps it is because GBC/Developers don’t like brownfield sites, as it is easier/cheaper to build on the Green Belt. No industrial waste to clear away!

I personally feel that the excessive amount of new housing and warehousing, which has been proposed for our village is untenable. I ask that my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector and receive confirmation of receipt of my letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the complete lack of any infrastructure proposal to support the increase in housing. The local schools in Send and Ripley are over capacity and were, in 2014, when the previous Plan was promoted. There is only one doctor's surgery which covers the Send and Ripley areas. It was at capacity in 2014, and still is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3396  Respondent: 10905825 / Bridgette Hampton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13984  Respondent: 10906081 / TK and AM Williams  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Also, I strongly oppose the GBC plans to propose a major housing building programme in both East/West Horsley and on the old Ripley Airfield. I find the whole scheme totally abhorrent. My reasons are as follows:-

1 The local infrastructure is already overloaded and up to its limits. The schools are full. The medical services at Horsley Medical Centre are stretched to capacity and the drainage on the roads cannot cope. As it is; the roads flood with heavy rain.

2 The local railway stations will not be able to cope with approx an extra 1500 persons. The rush hour trains are already full and there will be insufficient car parking space. There certainly is no adequate bus service in the area.

3 The proposals to build what amounts to another Surrey village on Ripley Airfield is ridiculous. 2100 new houses means at least 4000 cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9141  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. The scale of the proposed developments in this area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic levels. Many of the roads in this area are in poor condition and the proposed increase in traffic will lead to more danger for all road users, many of whom have no choice but to use these roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9148  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12741  Respondent: 10910625 / Alyson Blackwell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels – roads, doctors, schools will not be able to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12148  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic. I live on a narrow lane, single track in places, with no pavements. We already run the gauntlet of speeding traffic when we go out of our drive. One of my neighbours was told by a passing policeman that she shouldn't walk her children down the road for this reason.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12159  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17177  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Proposed Local Plan because Send Road is already a highly congested and crossing from one side to the other is hazardous. I know this first hand as my mother lived on one side of the road and was too nervous to cross to the other side to use the local shop. Similarly, some years ago her elderly neighbour was knocked down and killed on this same stretch of road. Send is a small village, not a major conurbation. The traffic through Ripley would, similarly, destroy the village, if the proposed 2,500 houses and industrial units suddenly be incorporated in to the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/855  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned
growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

The most distressing element of this plan is that such a large proportion of the overall proposed development is being targeted on this small part of the borough. It is simply disproportionate and there is little understanding being shown by those elected to represent our views. I trust, therefore, that these objections will be given your full attention and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1968</th>
<th>Respondent: 10911201 / Claire Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I welcome the clearer wording regarding timing, phasing and application of planning conditions and obligations. It is imperative that no developments should be approved without clear, acceptable and funded plans in place to provide adequate and effective infrastructure of all types and that even where approval has been given, development must follow provision of infrastructure and not proceed without such infrastructure.

There is concern about the inability of current infrastructure to meet current and future needs. The policy recognises that the “Infrastructure provider” will maintain infrastructure in most cases, and developers can only offer a contribution via Community Infrastructure Levy. Until the current infrastructure can meet existing needs adequately, further development should be very targeted to meet only absolute essentials.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11118</th>
<th>Respondent: 10911425 / Andrew Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

If all the 5,000 proposed new homes are from the Wisley junction of the M25 and Burpham are built there would be an additional 10,000 new cars using what is already an over congested local roads. Ripley is constantly gridlocked at peak times and the A3 constantly queues back to Burpham.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Comment ID: PSLPP16/15506  Respondent: 10911425 / Andrew Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. The Plan will make the roads dangerous and accidents will become common place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15509  Respondent: 10911425 / Andrew Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity. There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14033  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the impact of further congestion on local village roads and lanes.
2. I object to the impact that additional residents will have on local roads, health services, education spaces and policing needs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16143  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:
I object to the impact that additional residents will have on local roads, health services, education spaces and policing needs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

The detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough give cause for concern. There are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains; • The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

**LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme.** It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

**HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.**
There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools. Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, this needs to be done earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsleys.

The failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. I therefore object to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds, and to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3990  Respondent: 10913377 / Isabelle Stevens  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9109  Respondent: 10914849 / Robert Yates  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The already oversubscribed local schools will not be able to accommodate such a huge influx of new pupils.

The Local Doctors surgery will not have the capacity to accommodate such a huge influx of new patients.

The already creaking Sewage system in Send will not be able to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7220</th>
<th>Respondent: 10915361 / Judy Young</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY I1 – Infrastructure and delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to this policy as it is inadequate in addressing the scale of insufficient infrastructure in greenfield sites. The problem does not lie on our strategic road network but on the small arteries through our villages. The capacity of these roads is inadequate for existing population and cannot accommodate any growth. In particular, West Horsley already has an unacceptable traffic situation especially around commuter and school journeys, with two overused roads where traffic pays no regard to speed limits. It is only a matter of time until there is a serious incident. These existing roads cannot support additional capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8120</th>
<th>Respondent: 10917537 / Elin Keyser</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As I’m sure you are aware, the school shortage (amongst other infrastructure issues) has and is still affecting many of the residents in this area. I have experienced this first hand and can assure you that a large influx of students without major investment in either a new school, or upsizing the existing – such as the Howard of Effingham – would be catastrophic. Had this been proposed with any degree of confidence in the ‘plan’ I would be interested to hear what the suggested solution to the narrow and badly kept roads which link residents to schools in the area would be. It is clear that this would require major work, which would likely cause chaos for an extended period of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likewise, the commuter trains into London are already packed and adding another rail line or the facilities for faster trains would only encroach further onto the countryside we are trying to save.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The land is not only valuable for residents but attracts a number of tourists to the area which bring obvious benefits to local communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16639</th>
<th>Respondent: 10918369 / Kendall Collinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no allowance for the infrastructure - the school is overloaded as is the GP surgery, car parks etc… there are not enough green spaces for playgrounds in West Horsley and the roads cannot take any more traffic. in addition, the roads are liable to flooding as are the fields. I don’t think it is necessary to build on a field or green space especially when there are brownfield sites available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am concerned that because the landowners want to sell and the developers want to build, the Council will go ahead without considering the local people. They are keen to tick boxes for housing needed in our area. The Green Belt exists to prevent this so that green spaces can be respected and preserved for reason of health - less car pollution and also mental health with more space to help people to feel well and have a chance to go into open spaces. The council need to think about playgrounds and footpaths and bridleways. The landowners have been very bad at allowing people to access footpaths. The green belt belongs to the community and should be preserved not eroded. This plan would mean that the green belt boundary would be moved and so would lead to much more development with houses popping up everywhere. Everyone will want to make a quick buck.

East Horsley. Similar to West Horsley - there is not the infrastructure to support further development and the roads are impassible as it is. Near the Hotel-Ramada development is a possibility if done sensibly and to support local people rather than large 5 bedroomed houses that our children won’t be able to afford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8293  Respondent: 10918657 / Angus MacDonald  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/687  Respondent: 10919105 / Susan Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
This proposed level of planning does not seem to take into account

1) The increased risk of flooding to nearby homes and roads when fields are being built on. (Garlicks Arch at Burnt Common)

2) The lack of public transport.

3) The increased volume of traffic on roads which cannot cope with now.

4) The fact that children are already unable to get into schools of choice

5) The Health services are already under pressure in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14778  **Respondent:** 10920129 / Steven Marshall  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Transport OBJECT. As I have already stated, the infrastructure of East Horsley is the main reason for objecting to the Council's proposals. The roads are already congested, are generally narrow, with potholes. During heavy rains, the drains block and flooding results. The local primary school, the Raleigh, is at capacity as is the local secondary school, the Howard of Effingham. I understand that Horsley Medical Centre is also at capacity. Forcing a further 593 new homes (from the 11 development sites identified for East and West Horsley) into the village will have terrible results for everyone who lives here. Add in the proposed development of a new town at Wisley airfield and it is apparent that the infrastructure cannot cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/102  **Respondent:** 10921185 / Yvonne Harrington  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing need numbers

I object to the lack of any provision for new schools. Every year children from the villages of Send and Ripley are being sent to schools miles away from home. This leaves parents in the impossible position of travelling miles to school and some inevitably with very long journeys, how can this be good for the child not withstanding the carbon impact it has.

I object to the fact that the Doctors surgeries in the area are already stretched and there does not appear to be any immediate provision for this to be rectified.

I object to the planned new on/off ramp on the A3 traffic is already horrendous through the village and there only has to be an accident anywhere near the M25 junction for a vast amount of cars to exit the A3 and drive through the villages to
try and beat the traffic. On some mornings it is a horrendous experience just trying to get out onto the Portsmouth Road in Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6283  Respondent: 10921921 / V Groves  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered at any point in this proposed Local Plan, and are inadequate to deal with proposed increase in housing levels. Roads, public transport, availability at doctor’s surgery and places within schools will be unable to cope with the increase in housing and population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16522  Respondent: 10921921 / V Groves  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered at any point in this proposed Local Plan, and are inadequate to deal with proposed increase in housing levels. Roads, public transport, availability at doctor’s surgery and places within schools will be unable to cope with the increase in housing and population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12065  Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12074</th>
<th>Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14444</th>
<th>Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)**

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14450</th>
<th>Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**13. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6514</th>
<th>Respondent: 10922945 / Toby Meredith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequently there is obviously no room for all the extra traffic and people these developments will produce.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6516  
Respondent: 10922945 / Toby Meredith  
Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to GBC ignoring the problem of lack of infrastructure in the Send, Ripley, Clandon, Garlick’s Arch (A43), Wisley Airfield (A35) and Gosdon Farm (A25) areas. The existing infrastructure is poor because:

1. Roads. Our small country roads and lanes are narrow (some single track), have no footpaths and are in poor condition. They are already prone to congestion in some areas (e.g. Send, Ripley and Clandon). The resulting huge amount of extra traffic that these developments will produce will be a total disaster and make the area very dangerous to travel, by car or otherwise.

2. Medical facilities. The local medical facilities are already at full capacity and some are refusing new patients.

3. Schools. Local schools are oversubscribed and some local children already have to travel out of the area to go to school.

4. Public transport. Bus routes are few and far between and often cancelled. The small local stations are always overcrowded and car parking is over spilling into residential roads.

Consequently there is obviously no room for all the extra traffic and people these developments will produce.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7536  
Respondent: 10923265 / Colin Lewis  
Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to object to the proposal to remove East and West Horsley from the Green Belt and to extend the boundaries of the Settlement areas of the Horsleys, for the following reasons:

The Horsleys are villages that cannot cope with further developments that will increase the population.

Facilities such as schools, shops, medical facilities are overloaded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11336</th>
<th>Respondent: 10923297 / Matthew Burnham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY)

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
- No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16659</th>
<th>Respondent: 10923745 / Marwan Khalek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13128</th>
<th>Respondent: 10924609 / H Perryman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object because of concern about poor air quality. The massive developments being proposed in the north east of the borough will lead to worse road congestion and therefore to higher levels of air pollution.

I object to the population density of the proposed developments, which are often higher than most city boroughs. This is not a sensible way to treat the countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1668</th>
<th>Respondent: 10924897 / Louis Botha</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Policy I:

I object to the failure of the Council to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the Guildford urban area, which must be targeted first for development before countryside and the Green Belt. I also object to the failure of the Council to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/228  Respondent: 10925025 / Theresa Roads  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of provision to improve the current infrastructure which is currently inadequate.
2. I object to the lack of additional parking provisions in the villages – again which are currently inadequate.
3. I object to the 4 way junction to the A3 which will force more traffic through the already overloaded roads, which incidentally are in a very poor state of repair.

1. I object to the Garlick’s Arch development as it does not provide for sufficient Utilities capacity which is currently almost at capacity.
2. I object to the designated 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch as this is in addition to the 13,000 odd already proposed for the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3407  Respondent: 10927137 / Mary Pargeter  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

INFRASTRUCTURE

- Sewer flooding at Bridge End, Ockham Lane continues to occur. Thames Water and the Environment Agency and GBC have been made aware of this since Nothing has been resolved and the surcharging manholes continue.
- Ripley treatment works is over capacity and the sewer network is in There is not the capacity to add any further development at all. It is already overloaded and cannot cope as it stands.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery

I would like to object to the proposed developments as in my view they are unsustainable. The facilities in West Horsley are already very limited, we have one convenience store, one newsagent and a garage/MOT centre. In terms of public transport there is a very limited bus service that runs on weekdays only so for most people their needs are met by driving to East Horsley or elsewhere. We have one primary school, The Raleigh School, which is full every year meaning some local parents have to take their children further afield. Clearly West Horsley does not have the facilities to accommodate high volumes of new housing development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11860  Respondent: 10927553 / Marion Harris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

When the Wimpey estate was built it adversely affected the local school, the doctors surgery and the whole ambience of the village. Has anyone considered enlarging the school and building a larger surgery to cope with the hundreds of extra people? This is quite apart from the roads and the bus services. Would a train service take the strain off the roads? Where is the nearest useful station, can the railway be extended? It is much simpler to put the housing on brownfield sites in the towns before even thinking about despoiling the green and pleasant countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14014  Respondent: 10927841 / Frank Milton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of understanding of the infrastructure constraints of the proposed new households on the Horsley villages and to the absence of any effort to deal with them

If around 2,600 new houses were built in the Horsleys, Ockham and Wisley airfield this could easily result in around 5,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages.

Traffic

This would have a huge impact on local roads which as outlined above have little scope to be widened (e.g. pinch point at Lynx Hill on Ockham Road South and the restricted area on East Lane) or otherwise altered to cater for such an increase.
Although it is proposed to upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction. SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guilshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane (all not suitable for increased traffic volume) for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond.

The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”.

A local plan when proposing new housing on a substantial scale must surely plan for the implications of increased traffic both on the major roads such as the A3 and the minor village roads. The current draft local plan has not given such issues enough consideration

Parking

Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the Horsley medical centre and at the village hall will not be able to cope with this additional demand.

Flooding

The site behind Ockham Road North in East Horsley is partially a level 3 flood risk area, and local residents are well aware of how much standing water there is in their gardens after rain. Building on such land will only exacerbate the problem. Other areas of the Horsleys are also flooded when it rains become the drains are inadequate. Substantially more houses will exacerbate the problem but no attention has been paid to drainage in the local plan.

- Schools and medical facilities

Amenities

Local schools and medical facilities are already at capacity.

No extra school places are planned in the Horsleys and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project. 2600 new houses could easily mean 2600 children looking for school place!

I trust the Council will review its Local Plan basing it on a model which is available for inspection and with more attention to the infrastructure implications and use of brown field sites rather than destroy our precious Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
And to that GBC wants to add at least 6000 people with roughly 3000 cars???
A few new entrance and exit ramps won’t mend that traffic density, not to mention the air pollution, nor all the
other resulting problems.

This latest Guildford Local Plan won’t keep northern Surrey a desirable living area with reliable household incomes
which support the local community, but will destroy it into an overpopulated suburban area with the foreseeable amount
of social problems.

Please reconsider the decision with your conscience.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure
(Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3822  **Respondent:** 10928769 / John Slatford  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the apparent lack of any provision for new infrastructure, that is; roads, schools, medical or hospital facilities, etc.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3663  **Respondent:** 10928897 / Patricia Farmer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the apparent lack of any provision for new infrastructure that is: roads, schools, medical or hospital facilities, etc.

There are already far too many problems with traffic and congestion within the Borough and seemingly, nothing in the Plan to deal with the resultant inevitable increases of new housing and popu l

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/10238  **Respondent:** 10930081 / Helen Court  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools - the new Send Primary building is currently under construction with no space for additional classes.

I object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors surgeries - we already struggle to get an appointment in our current surgery - more houses will make this impossible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Over the years, the village increase in size and so has the traffic most of which is heading to the traffic jams on the A3 and M25. I therefore OBJECT to the inclusion of a further A3 junction at Burnt Common.

As a long time resident I believe that the area cannot take any increase in population or traffic. AND I OBJECT to the proposal to put large industrial buildings on Garlick's Arch farmland.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Our villages are at their limits when it comes to infrastructure - roads, schools, doctors' surgeries etc. What we find incredible is that the Plan says very little about how this infrastructure is going to be upgraded for the planned growth - and who is going to pay for it? In East Horsley the Medical Centre is full and when one can get an appointment to see a doctor there is never anywhere to park. The Raleigh School is full. The main road through the village (Ockham Road North and South) cannot cope with the current traffic flows, let alone any increase. Any time we have significant rainfall the road floods. It is also very dangerous for pedestrians to walk along the narrow and uneven pavement, particularly at night. Where are the specific proposals in the Plan to deal with the very real issues facing residents? Where are the specific plans to upgrade the infrastructure to cope with forced growth that is being proposed?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads due to the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
There is far too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause dramatically more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to alleviate it.

The rural roads in this area are in poor condition, narrow and many have no footpaths. To add 5000 more houses would result in dangerous and unsustainable traffic with nearly 10,000 additional cars as well as delivery vehicles to service them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11330  Respondent: 10930945 / Peter Perry  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

) I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

The medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough will simply be unable to cope, creating chaos for existing and new residents alike.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15263  Respondent: 10930945 / Peter Perry  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

The medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough will simply be unable to cope, creating chaos for existing and new residents alike.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2806  Respondent: 10932353 / G.A and U.E West  Agent:
Thank you for your letter of 2nd June in which you invited comments on the Proposed Local Plan.

Firstly, in general, the proposal to build a substantial number of new houses at several sites around Guildford will inevitably increase the congestion currently existing on many roads but especially on the A3. It will of course also put severe pressure on the infrastructure. The possibility that in several years time extra lanes will be added to the A3 as well as other measures referred to in the plan that are intended to mitigate congestion and deal with the changes to infrastructure are inadequate. In our opinion the rapid expansion of the urban area leading to loss of green belt is unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10803  Respondent: 10932801 / Angela Grenham  Agent:

Policy I1-I4

I object to the above policies primarily because they appear to suggest that infrastructure is not being considered as a pre-condition of development. The Local Plan does not provide confirmed plans for the improvements to infrastructure which would be required to support even a proportionate amount of new housing. Much of the local infrastructure is already inadequate or at capacity, evidenced by congested and poor-conditioned rural roads, frequent flooding issues, lack of healthcare facilities and the need for First Responders and defibrillators due to distance from accident and emergency facilities.

It is essential that infrastructure improvements are confirmed and fully funded before decisions are taken on proportionate housing development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1723  Respondent: 10933793 / Julia Tilbury  Agent:

POLICY I1 - Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT. Most of the borough's infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan's commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.
The plan targets greenfield sites—requiring heavy infrastructure investment—in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. "12 This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous
collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary
to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages
development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs
in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this
policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration.
Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-
widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but
they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken
place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers
to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and
unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in
this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the
plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first
assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.12
This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow 12 on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes
implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income.
Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

12 Residents have been incredulous at the Council’s failure to apply infrastructure constraints to housing numbers, in
response first to the Issues and Options paper and then to the 2014 draft local plan. There were 20,000 responses each
time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14388</th>
<th>Respondent: 10938241 / Alan Brockbank</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the Council’s inadequacy in assessing infrastructure needs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18083</th>
<th>Respondent: 10939073 / Katie Waldner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/18655  **Respondent:** 10939201 / Dylan White  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )* 

Many years ago it was decided to build the A3 as it would solve all our problems, it is now full up.

Also many years ago, it was decided to build the M25 as this would solve all our problems all the way around London, it is now full up.

It is blindly obvious that the south east of England has reached capacity on the roads and on the railways. What is needed is vast investment in the Midlands and the north of England so people move up there. Bring on the Northern Powerhouse!!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9611  **Respondent:** 10940673 / Carolyn Davis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )* 

1. **I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)**

The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on the road infrastructure between Guildford and the M25.
The roads through Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion as cars fight their way to get to the A3 and M25. The proposed development of 13,680 new houses in the area will mean, at a minimum, 13,680 new cars on the road and will mean grid-lock at peak times: week-day mornings between 6am to 9:30am, week-day afternoons from 3:00pm to 6:30pm. This is not sustainable from the increase in congestion as well as the greater pollution impact.

I object to the proposed development detailed in the local plan which will result in more traffic using narrow rural roads as well as a further deterioration in the road surface. Our roads do not have pedestrian footpaths and the proposed levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9614  Respondent: 10940673 / Carolyn Davis  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)

I object. I have grave concerns that no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to any development taking place, the existing residents in the local areas of Ripley, Send and Clandon will experience a deterioration in quality of life in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12806  Respondent: 10940833 / Natasha Taylor  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day) for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough's infrastructure is already heavily strained.

However the plan's determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number. The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

I object to the impact that additional residents will have on local roads, health services, education spaces and policing needs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/2782 | Respondent: 10942081 / G J Teague | Agent: |
| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 |

5. Infrastructure and Environment

The scale of development proposed for the Horsleys, together with other planned development in adjacent areas, threatens severe strain on local facilities and thus unacceptable impairment of residents' quality of life. Serious probable impacts include:

- Traffic: allowing for 2 cars per new house, potentially up to a 1,000 additional vehicles in the Horsleys alone will require access to, and use of, the Ockham Road(s), Forest Road and the A246. The existing congestion on these routes will likely be severely exacerbated. These routes cannot easily be widened without unacceptable encroachment on existing households, and increasing the speed limit would constitute an unacceptable risk to safety. No serious assessment of the impact on the existing local transport network appears to have been included.

- Parking: The car parks at both Horsley and Effingham Stations are already full on week days, likewise the car park at the Horsley Medical Centre, and close to full at most times of day at the two main shopping parades in East Horsley. No thought appears to have been given to the Development at Wisley Aerodrome would likely further exacerbate the situation, given that these stations are the closest to that site.

- Pollution: The large increase in the volume of traffic in the Horsleys resulting from the proposed plan will materially increase existing nitrogen dioxide and particulate emissions. Again, no consideration appears to have been given to this impact.
• Medical Facilities: The Horsleys are served by just one outpatient medical centre (with 4 permanent full time practitioners), and it is now common to have to wait two weeks or longer for a GP appointment. Adding potentially 1,000 new residents (allowing for at least two residents for each new home) risks straining the existing service to breaking point. The Plan appears to take no account of this impact.

- Schools: Schools in the Horsleys are at, or close to, capacity. No new school places appear to be planned to provide for the increased demand resulting from the creation of new households. No account appears to have been taken of this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9305  **Respondent:** 10943457 / Henry Benzikie  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I OBJECT**, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

**I OBJECT** to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment...
without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/668  **Respondent:** 10944513 / Amber Ellis  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.
This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• The impact on already stretched local facilities, infrastructure and services that would result from the plan is not addressed to any satisfactory level within the plan and therefore makes the plan unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/210</th>
<th>Respondent: 10949601 / Victoria Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Congestion on the trunk roads, A3/M25**
   I object to the development of the strategic sites due to A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.

2. **Congestion on the local village roads and lanes**
   Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. I object to further development which will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.

3. **Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic**
   Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

4. **Poor air quality concerns**
   Further congestion, particularly in built up residential areas will only lead to greater levels of air pollution. I object to further development, which will result a fall in the air quality.

1. **Lack of Utilities Capacity**
   Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. I object to the development of Garlick’s Arch on the ground that there is little capacity in these networks.

2. **Sites being planned in unsustainable locations**
   Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

3. **Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population**
   Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. To which I object.

4. **Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed**
   Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object due to the further stress it will put upon existing health services.

5. **Local policing facilities will be overwhelmed**
   Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the likes of Garlick’s Arch and Wisley Airfield will stretch the police services further and I object.

6. **Local social welfare facilities will be overwhelmed**

7. **Local shops/restaurant facilities will be overwhelmed**

8. **No protection of heritage assets**

9. **No protection of the environment**
10. Overdevelopment of sites. I object to the existing overdevelopment of Ripley - it is a small village and should remain so.

11. Not meeting the needs of local communities. I object to the fact that you seem to insist on ignoring what the local communities are telling you. We pay to live here - you need to start listening.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6465  **Respondent:** 10949921 / Jan Parker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6466  **Respondent:** 10949921 / Jan Parker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). The current and existing services are overstretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/18661  **Respondent:** 10949921 / Jan Parker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **Congestion on the trunk roads, A3/M25**
   I object to the development of the strategic sites due to A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.

2. **Congestion on the local village roads and lanes**
   Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. I object to further development which will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.
3. Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic
   Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

4. Poor air quality concerns
   Further congestion, particularly in built up residential areas will only lead to greater levels of air pollution. I object to further development, which will result a fall in the air quality.

5. Lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites
   I object to the lack of planning and implementation of infrastructure. For example at Garlick’s Arch. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ quality of life will significantly deteriorate in many ways. How will the local services such as doctors and schools cope?

6. Lack of Utilities Capacity
   Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. I object to the development of Garlick’s Arch on the ground that there is little capacity in these networks.

7. Sites being planned in unsustainable locations
   Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

8. Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population
   Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. To which I object.

9. Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed
   Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object due to the further stress it will put upon existing health services.

10. Local policing facilities will be overwhelmed
    Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the likes of Garlick’s Arch and Wisley Airfield will stretch the police services further and I object.

11. Local social welfare facilities will be overwhelmed

12. Local shops/restaurant facilities will be overwhelmed

13. No protection of heritage assets

14. No protection of the environment

15. Overdevelopment of sites. I object to the existing overdevelopment of Ripley - it is a small village and should remain so

16. Not meeting the needs of local communities. I object to the fact that you seem to insist on ignoring what the local communities are telling you. We pay to live here - you need to start listening

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/11600  Respondent: 10951105 / Richard Bray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Schools are totally full – heavy reliance on private schools.

(2) One Medical Centre in Kingston Avenue serving circa 12,000 people (bursting). II

(3) Drainage overloaded and not maintained. II

(4) Roads overused and constantly requiring maintenance. Public car parks constantly in use. II

(5) Railway Station – Horsley – extremely busy and car park full on weekdays.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10368  Respondent: 10951489 / Lorna M Cave  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that you can’t possibly have thought of the impact on the infrastructure in Send – the surgery, the school and most of all, the roads won’t be able to cope.

All of the above I beg you to consider very carefully, but the over-riding impact of these objections has to be the traffic through Send. Believe me, Send cannot take anymore.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17895  Respondent: 10952193 / Chrissie Beard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

No genuine consideration has been given to the local infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Local schools are under serious pressure and are unable to meet the needs of local students.

We have insufficient local health provision from GP practices.

Our local hospital is already overstretched and could not meet the needs of an increased population.

Despite repeated planning application our local hospital is constantly refused planning permission to extend its parking facilities for local people on the grounds of its proximity to the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration of road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.
This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough's infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan's determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable. Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The local infrastructure is creaking and crumbling already, these plans will simply make it worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4649  Respondent: 10957025 / Pauline Masters  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.
This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• The plan gives no significant thought to the increase in traffic on the local roads due to either the proposed school or the housing. The plan merely seems to indicate that work would need to be done by the developer and does not take a view on whether it would be feasible to actually accomplish this. Certainly, if the majority of residents in the proposed development and the majority of pupils and staff travelled in and out by using Glaziers Lane and Westwood Road, I cannot see how the junctions with the A323 would cope, nor how they could actually be “improved” in order to cope with the additional traffic.

• Another infrastructure consideration that seems to have almost been overlooked is the capacity for wastewater disposal in Normandy. We have recently have had to have a non-return valve installed to prevent wastewater from backwashing through our drains, which is an effect of the exiting wastewater provision being unable to cope with the exiting demand – let alone with an additional 1100 homes and a 7 form secondary school!

• Much is made of the ability for the pupils and residents of the new village to use the existing Wanborough railway station. However, for the pupils that are envisaged to come in from the proposed Blackwell Farm development, they won’t be able to commute by train until 2033 for at east 10 years – at the touted Guildford West station won’t be built until then!

In short, I do not believe that any of this add up to the so called “exceptional circumstances” that GBC have said themselves would need to be tabled in order to warrant the release this parcel of land from Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6657  Respondent: 10958753 / Ingrid Molossi  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6658</th>
<th>Respondent: 10958753 / Ingrid Molossi</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17731</th>
<th>Respondent: 10958913 / Alan Batterbury</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is already far too much traffic in our villages and this plan will further create more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon. The existing roads are in poor quality and in particular the rural roads are extremely narrow and in some areas there is no provision for footpaths or cycle lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17745  Respondent: 10958913 / Alan Batterbury  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy l1)
The Plan does not identify suitable infrastructure improvements to provide the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick's Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the infrastructure schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, medical services and school are already nearing full capacity.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8999  Respondent: 10959009 / Rebecca Claridge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy l1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/6691  Respondent: 10959073 / Janine Light  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live along Long Reach, West Horsley, a road that is not suitable for heavy vehicles. This road is very narrow and plagued with pot holes, this year alone I have damaged 5 tyres on my car !!! It is not always possible to see where the pot holes are when it has rained and the road is flooded. Long Reach floods every time we have any rain. Will new drainage be put in to support Long Reach?

I am concerned that the land proposed to build on in Long Reach has natural gas pipes under the fields. This certainly doesn't give me confidence regarding our safety.

How will the local schools, medical centre cope with this huge increase of population? Will my granddaughter be able to attend school in the village with such a huge increase of population?

I am strongly apposed to the volume of proposed Development Sites. This is a small village, which does not have the infrastructure to cope with this huge increase of population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18403  Respondent: 10959265 / Inger & Ron Ward  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. **I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18489</th>
<th>Respondent: 10959265 / Inger &amp; Ron Ward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong></td>
<td><strong>is Sound? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I **OBJECT**, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I **OBJECT** to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past...
through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/18490 | Respondent: 10959265 / Inger & Ron Ward | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 |

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/1230 | Respondent: 10959425 / Jan Lofthouse | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 |

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
NO INFRASTRUCTURE
I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools and Doctors Surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12285  Respondent: 10962689 / Martin Ladd  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local
road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the resultant increase in traffic will impact negatively on road safety and will result in more collisions on the road. This road network struggles to cope with current levels of traffic now and the proposed plans for an A3 ramp at Burnt Common will not alleviate traffic in Ripley, Send or Clandon.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the reduction in recreational spaces will have negative impacts on young people especially and reduces the space available for sport and exercise.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that it will result in a greater demand on school places in under fives, primary and secondary. This will make it much harder for parents to send their child to their first choice school and therefore more difficult for parents to ensure their child’s needs are catered for.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that this development will result in overcrowding in schools and a demand for more school building at a time when school finances have been cut and schools therefore cannot afford this kind of expansion.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the plans for development are of poor quality and layout – the layout plans are unsustainable in the long-term and poorly thought through.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the plans show a lack of planning for pedestrian footpath and therefore the plan is both inconvenient and dangerous for pedestrians. This is especially important in an area where there is a significant elderly population who are unable to drive (see Ripley Good Neighbours).

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the plan shows an overdevelopment of sites that is both unnatural and unsightly. The plans show developments that are concentrated and cramped.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that local restaurants and shops will be completely overwhelmed and will be unable to cater for the increased demand resulting from these developments. The local plan shows very little consideration for this.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the welfare facilities of these areas in the plan will be totally overcome by the increased demand and will disserve both current residents and those who would live in the developments proposed in the plan. There is very little room to expand these facilities and little mention of this in the plan.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the current policing of the area would not be able to cope with the increased population of these proposed areas and at a time when funding has been reduced, would be unable to provide an acceptable service. This would be extremely problematic and potentially dangerous for the local residents of Clandon, Ripley and Send.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the local health care service would be unable to cope with this proposed increase in population and, similarly, at a time when funding has been reduced, would be unable to provide an acceptable service. The Send Villages Medical Centre is already overloaded with patients and lack staff and space to cater for even more patients.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that parking in these villages and the surrounding areas is limited and is already very difficult. An associated increase in population as proposed in the local plan will only increase these difficulties. Ripley, Send and Clandon suffer from a lack of parking and the increases in population of these areas associated with the development plans will only worsen this problem.

Lastly I wish to strongly object specifically from the perspective of a 23 year old - whilst I understand the important need for more housing across the country I wish to make clear how important this space is to me, and many of my age group. The beautiful yet unembellished nature of this space just outside of London is unique. I hope, like many, to be able to enjoy this space and appreciate what these historic villages have to offer for the rest of my life.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14046</th>
<th>Respondent: 10965953 / Mark Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our infrastructure is already fully stretched at EH medical centre &amp; Horsley station car park, &amp; schools are full to capacity. Roads are narrow &amp; cannot take further traffic, also affects the ability to use narrow pavement. East Horsley is currently used as a cut-through from Dorking via Green Dene/A246 to Jct 10 on the M25. East Horsley is already becoming more congested on our narrow roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15686</th>
<th>Respondent: 10967329 / Steve Johnson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure already overloaded - The local Schools are full. Medical facilities stretched. Drainage is inadequate, roads &amp; car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11948</th>
<th>Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1) There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11957</th>
<th>Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16943  Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, the local GP practice and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7916  Respondent: 10967937 / Sean Robinson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT TO PRESSURE ON GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE with it now being far more difficult to get appointments at the Send Barns surgery. I had to drive down to book an appointment for my teenage daughter as when phoned at 8 am being unable to get through that would be my only option for an emergency appointment. This has never been case in the recent past. Send’s infrastructure cannot cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12537  Respondent: 10968129 / Sheila Remnant  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The timing for all the building proposed seems crazy to me ie build houses, then consider sewage/water arrangements, then build roads and when all this is done a tunnel under all this new build might be considered - then where would the tunnel entrance be when all suitable land has been built on. How stupid is that?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2348  Respondent: 10969249 / Kim Taylor-PEAT  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12974  Respondent: 10972065 / Sarah Cocke  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY II

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8496  **Respondent:** 10984385 / Julie Cameron  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Please note this email which comprises my objections to the Guildford Local Plan 2016.

Firstly, I believe that Guildford Borough Council has not followed correct procedure, in that significant changes have been made to the plan without due consultation, especially as regards housing and road junctions. Specifically relating to Send, where I live, the highways infrastructure, forming a main link to and from the M25 and A3 and one of the few places to cross the river, is already under pressure and cannot cope with further influx of traffic. Increased traffic flow would impact adversely on village life and Send residents’ parking would be affected.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9217  **Respondent:** 10985057 / Anthony Parker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

POLICY I1 Infrastructure and delivery – I OBJECT. Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth.

However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The Council’s methodology assessing traffic and roads infrastructure needs is inadequate. It identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to
developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsustainable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/8379</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10989601 / Margaret Mew</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Glandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy 11)

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network, telephone cables and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/384</th>
<th>Respondent: 10990465 / Victoria Bean</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8748</th>
<th>Respondent: 10990657 / Diana Owen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal to have up to 593 new houses in the Horsleys would put the infrastructure of the local schools, medical facilities, shops and parking under enormous pressure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/2110</th>
<th>Respondent: 10991841 / Abbey Jarman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposed local plan:

1. The reduction in the number of new homes in the Green Belt is insufficient. There is still an enormous number of new dwellings proposed for construction in the Green Belt, particularly when considered in proportion to the number of existing homes.
2. It is proposed that the area east of the borough takes an even higher number of dwelling in the Green Belt than before.
3. Many other councils have chosen not to constrain overall housing growth to protect the Green Belt, yet Guildford has not. Although the objectively-assessed housing target has been reduced since the 2016 plan to 12,466 dwellings by 2034, this still represent a 25% growth for Guildford, which is disproportionate.
4. Nothing has changed since last year’s consultation to address the sustainability aspects of the West Horsley development sites, as is required by national policy requirements. No matter how much people are encouraged to
travel on foot or by cycling, each new home will need at least one car to give access to Horsley station, shops, medical centre, library, etc.; this is easily demonstrable.

5. More apartments are needed in Guildford, not more retail space. The rise of on-line shopping and the reduction in physical shopping is clearly documented and many authoritative reports support that view that the trend will continue.

6. No changes have been made to the proposal to inset both East and West Horsley from the Green Belt. Policy P2 states that the Metropolitan Green Belt will continue to be protected against inappropriate development. I object to the village’s removal from the Green Belt by inserting and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries.

7. The overload of local social and physical infrastructure is not addressed. Increased demand for access to medical facilities, schools, station parking, roads, and particularly disposal of waste water remains at large.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11154  Respondent: 10992065 / Saskia Janssen  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure and facilities already stretched. Even without the plan in place we are struggling with the current infrastructure.

I object to the current plan which has little to no plans for improving infrastructure and facilities.

As the local demographic is changing rapidly we are experiencing oversubscribed schools, medical services unable to cope, full roads and busy trains.

Our medical services, roads, schools and local shops won’t be able to cope with the suggested increase of 600 houses in the Horsleys over the next 5 years.

a) Horsley Medical Practise

In my view, the medical practise in particular is already beyond capacity. Getting an appointment is a struggle to say the least. I can’t see how a massive increase in houses is going to help improve the practise functioning properly without any plans for another medical practise in the area.

b) Primary and secondary state schools

The Raleigh school and the Howard of Effingham schools are bursting at their seams in their current state. I am well aware that new locations and buildings need to be found without the suggested local plan in place. I therefore support new locations and buildings for both allowing a better and suitable building to serve the numbers of children in the area. I can not imagine what it will mean with the suggested local plan in place and no plans for facilitating future generations of children with decent schooling. Shameful planning!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14632  Respondent: 10992225 / Emma Ringshaw  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. I have personally witnessed HGVs mounting the pavements on many occasions because they are unable to pass oncoming traffic any other way on this narrow road. Only last week one HGV only narrowly missed one of our neighbours who was walking with her children on the way to school.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure (policy I1). The sewerage system cannot cope, the schools are full and healthcare at breaking-point.

I object to the extra congestion that the development will cause to all local roads. The councillors should visit Ripley during morning rush-hour.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
Roads through West Clandon are extremely busy at rush hour and peak commuter periods. The development will only result in additional traffic through these routes, posing serious threats to life and health of villagers using the pavements and paths in the village. Heavy vehicles frequently mount the curbs and pavements at speed in these areas. Traffic is so heavy Station users in Clandon can wait for more than 10 minutes to pull out in busy periods, causing massive congestion in the village.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/369  **Respondent:** 10995233 / Pam Harnor  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the large number of additional homes, 693 per year for 15 years because the borough is already overcrowded with significant traffic congestion, air and noise pollution.

I object to any further development along the A3 corridor which is threatening an urban sprawl from the M25 to the Hogs Back with the villages being merged together.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/621  **Respondent:** 10995297 / Peter Cormack  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits “…we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create...
the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

**Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections**

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14031  **Respondent:** 10998913 / Brian & Amanda Alexander  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thirdly, I object to development due to traffic congestion. As it is, we cannot get to a station during rush-hours because of congestion. The A3 is regularly backed up, in both directions, making travelling anywhere an increasing frustration.

Fourthly, I object to the strain on local services. We are unable to get an appointment within a reasonable amount of time for a doctor. Schools are already under strain, police services are already dangerously low and there seems no further money to accommodate this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7500  **Respondent:** 11000289 / Nick Bomford  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object because the infrastructure is already overloaded
Local Schools are full. Medical facilities stretched. Drainage is inadequate, roads and car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements. Large increases in the volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in this area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3370</th>
<th>Respondent: 11000481 / Jan Benton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan due to the lack of essential infrastructure.

In particular I feel that the proposed housing developments at Wisley and Gosden Hill, Merrow should not go ahead until the present traffic problems around the area, particularly on the A3, have been addressed.

If a tunnel is an option then the plans for this must be made before any developments in the area take place.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12010</th>
<th>Respondent: 11000865 / Nicholas Clemens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3

These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst we support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give us cause for concern.

I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13891</th>
<th>Respondent: 11001249 / Lesley Milton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to the lack of understanding of the infrastructure constraints of the proposed new households on the Horsley villages and to the absence of any effort to deal with them.

- Traffic and parking

If around 2,600 new houses were built in the Horsleys, Ockham and Wisley airfield this could easily result in around 5,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. This will have a huge impact on local roads which have little scope to be widened (e.g. pinch point at Conisbees on Ockham Road South and the restricted area on East Lane) or otherwise altered to cater for such an increase. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall are not able to cope with additional demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17893  Respondent: 11001761 / Brandon Sievering  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is already a strain on public services and infrastructure in Send/Ripley. It can be difficult to get a GP/NHS dentist appointment, and the roads are typically poor condition and heavily congested. As a commuter the Send Marsh Rd/Portsmouth Rd junction already gets particularly congested, as does the Send Marsh Rd/A247 junction. The A3 to M25 Wisley interchange is a nightmare, and would not be able to deal with additional traffic (plans suggest some widening of this junction but nothing has been planned yet?). With further developments I would likely have to move elsewhere as my commute would be unbearable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6354  Respondent: 11002881 / Sheila Proctor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Similarly, the proposal to change the boundaries of the current settlements of East and West Horsley does not appear to have been tested on the ground and appears solely aimed at releasing land for development. The arguments for changing specific boundaries are in some cases contradictory, and in some cases fail to meet the test of identifying more sustainable boundaries than those currently defined. I therefore object to the proposal to change the boundaries of the settlements.

In addition I would observe that the existing infrastructure in the East and West Horsley area - in particular the roads and drainage - are not functioning in an acceptable manner at the present (viz. crowded, potholed and flooded under even mild rain conditions) and the prospect of the addition of the potential number of houses in the villages and the proximate addition of 2,000 at Ockham, 400 at Burnt Common and 2,000 at Gosden Hill Farm needs to be severely tested by the application of infrastructure constraints and I object to the strategic site proposals indicated and to the larger land areas within the villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13906  Respondent: 11002945 / David Guthrie  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4312  Respondent: 11003361 / Howard Milner  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the complete lack of provision of services for this proposed increase in population, Medical facilities, Schooling and local transport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16409  Respondent: 11004129 / Alastair Reid  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

DRAINS, WATER SUPPLY, FLOOD RISK, CONGESTION

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities, car parks and our roads just cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes will lead to flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

As a commuter I know that the car parks at both Effingham Junction and Horsley stations are full every working day. Believe you me I have seen the congestion that exists. Additional houses mean more cars which just won’t be able to be accommodated at either station. It can be estimated that even if 25% of these new households use the stations to commute to London then we are talking about accommodating 675 extra cars at either Horsley or Effingham station. Does Guildford Council have an answer to car parking on this scale? Of course not.

As an East Horsley resident I am opposed to the removal of the Horsleys from the Green Belt along with consideration of Three Farms Meadows (the former Wisley Airfield) for a new town of 2,100 homes for the following reasons:
1. West Horsley. The number of new homes will swamp the village and change its nature irrevocably. I am not opposed to the development of the Bell and Colville site for housing but am opposed to including any of the green belt land behind that site for potential development.

1. East Horsley. The open land around Horsley Towers should remain within the Green Belt. Horsley Towers is of immense historical interest and to build on its surrounding green fields would wreck the prospect of this attractive site. The same argument applies to the possible development of the Thatchers Hotel site. I am not opposed to the development of the former BT brownfield site opposite Bishopsmead Parade in East Horsley, for housing.

1. Land at the Great Ridings Wood end of Norrells Drive, East This large field is adjacent to the above Wood which was donated to and is managed by the Woodland Trust. The field preserves the Wood from suburban encroachment and should be retained as such.

1. Points (a), (b) and (c) above should be retained as such in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 83 which states that ‘Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.” The draft Local Plan mentions “exceptional circumstances” in paragraph 4.123, but presents no evidence that such exceptional circumstances exist. Moreover ministerial guidance has been published that makes it clear that unmet housing need should not normally be taken as such exceptional circumstances. Therefore the existing Green Belt should remain as currently defined.

1. Former Wisley Airfield. This is a large area of Metropolitan green Belt and is valuable farmland – and precious for agricultural use. It provides protected open space near the M25 and is a barrier to outward development from London. Creating a town – almost the size of the Horsleys combined – would cause irrevocable harm to the Green Belt as well as overwhelming local roads and facilities. The A3/M25 junction area is already overwhelmed with traffic for much of the day and has the highest pollution levels outside London.

In conclusion, I ask GBC to revise the housing number, and to amend the Local Plan to utilise brownfield/previously used land rather than green field sites – of which there are significant amounts of the former within the Borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Infrastructure

The infrastructure of the Horsleys is already overloaded. Local Schools are full, the medical centre is stretched, drainage is inadequate. Traffic and parking are already an issue and at high levels. There is little scope for improvement currently and the scale of development proposed is completely out of all proportion to the facilities available and the ability to increase those facilities. I note that in the proposal for 2000 houses on Wisley airfield they identify Horsley station as a transport link. Anyone who has bothered to visit Horsley will know that the station car park is already at near capacity. There is no provision in the Local Plan to improve this infrastructure in proportion to the proposed building.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy 11)

The Plan does not identify suitable infrastructure improvements to provide the huge scale of development, especially at Garrick's Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Localservices, utilities and sewerage, medical services and schools are already nearing full capacity.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15309  Respondent: 11007393 / James Culmer  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10447</th>
<th>Respondent: 11007425 / Kate McIver</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan does not identify suitable infrastructure improvements to provide the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick's Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, medical services and schools are already nearing full capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/77</th>
<th>Respondent: 11008033 / Sandra Reeves</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scale and pace of the proposed development in the draft Local Plan will forever change the rural nature of Send. The lack of infrastructure within Send/ Send Marsh/ Burnt Common and proximity to sensitive areas of nature means Send is not suitable for the changes proposed in the draft Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a mother of three children I choose to live in Send as I felt it would provide my children with a great place in which to grow up, however these proposals threaten to destroy all that is good about the village. It will lose its identity as a rural village and simply become a congested suburb. Already the roads are busy and with the scale of development proposed I feel there is not the infrastructure to cope with more traffic and more housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already the doctor’s surgery is very busy and it is difficult to get an appointment and the schools are over-subscribed. I want to feel safe crossing roads with my children without the worry of further traffic speeding along the local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This local plan is what the developers want and is certainly not what local residents such as myself want for Send. I very much hope that you will take these concerns into consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3969</th>
<th>Respondent: 11008225 / Russell Pascoe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **I OBJECT**, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I **OBJECT** to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. **I OBJECT** to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Finally, I object to the Plan because of its potential effect on our infrastructure in East and West Horsley. There are several aspects to this—schools, medical facilities, car parking, drainage, access to transport facilities, all are stretched at the moment. I will focus on just one aspect—roads in East Horsley. I live close to the Ockham Road South. This is already far too narrow to allow two lorries to pass without mounting the pavement. Frequently I am forced to drive on the pavement when builders' lorries and pick-ups come in the opposite direction. It is just not good enough to say that this is the responsibility of Surrey County Council. Does Guildford Borough Council not subscribe to a joined-up planning policy? By ignoring the limitations of the existing infrastructure supporting the Village, the Borough Council is planning a serious deterioration of the Quality of life here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Infrastructure:

West Horsley does not have any of the infrastructure to support the development proposed. The village is small with few local facilities. There is currently just one shop at the southern end of the village, where local car parking is very limited. Most people in West Horsley already have to travel, largely by car, to East Horsley for their day to day shopping, banking and health needs. The existing car parking facilities in East Horsley are already at capacity and any increase in the local population will add to the already existing problems. Any new development would not “support the continued viability” of the existing village infrastructure, as has been noted by the GBC in the past. Key infrastructure issues include:

- Education that is already under strain;
- The East Horsley Medical Centre is already at capacity and serves both East and West Horsley and some other surrounding villages such as Clandon;
- The utilities infrastructure cannot be further stretched and water pressure is very poor across much of the village already;
- The existing road system is only appropriate for a semi-rural village, many of the roads are little more than lanes and pavements are often only on one side of a carriageway.

Any development will need immediate and considerable investment in infrastructure to support any increase in the village size.

In summary, whilst I accept that some housing development is required across the borough and West Horsley should take its fair share; at present the Local Plan proposes excessive development within West Horsley (in proportion much greater than other locations across the borough) the requirements for which have not been proven in any way. In addition the current proposals do not support sustainable development of the village and the amendment to the Greenbelt runs contrary to National Planning Policy.

As a result I am strongly opposed to the current Local Plan proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes
infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/498  Respondent: 11010497 / John Ackerman  Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The other development issues in the local plan are still the same as before. You want to cram houses into some fields (533 I counted) in East and West Horsley, plus 2200 at Wisley and Ripley is under siege as well. I have protested in the past, but as this is a theoretical amendment, I am protesting again. Sites 38, 39, 40, and 41 are unsuitable. The village is small and the roads are narrow. The required lorry and construction traffic will jam the entire area for years and once it is completed will overwhelm the local facilities. You cannot get a doctor’s appointment for several days at the moment and another 1500 residents certainly wont help and that’s without the Wisley Development. Local schools are already under pressure and Secondary schools particularly. There is no provision for road improvement in Horsley.

The Ockham Road North development by the railway bridge will put hundreds more cars a day onto a difficult road, with narrow pavements, single file in places and significantly increase the risk of a pedestrian being struck by a passing car or lorry wing mirror. The road also floods easily and regardless of flood risk controls in building, the water will continue to fall and has to go somewhere. You cant just keep adding to a 1930’s infrastructure. The whole thing needs to be re thought if you are doing something like this. I did note that none of the Council representatives lived in the area!!!

The other 2 proposals in West Horsley are also overkill. You may have noticed that there is a stop and go bit of road where it is too narrow for cars to pass and only one lane can go at a time. East Street is certainly not suitable for an increase in traffic of this magnitude.
The final proposal in Ockham Road North is at least a bit further out, but still adds a significant volume of traffic to an already over busy road. I have live there for 27 years and the traffic increase is amazing in that time. It frequently takes several minutes to get out of my driveway and of course there is the mother’s jam at Raleigh and Glenesk schools.

In addition I have repeated the very well thought out objection to the Wisley Airfield below and there is nothing significant in the new plan which changes that situation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8816  **Respondent:** 11011585 / Martin Walker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the failure of the Council to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the Guildford urban area, which must be targeted first for development before countryside and the Green Belt. I also object to the failure of the Council to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6893  **Respondent:** 11011969 / Diana Gibson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3810  **Respondent:** 11012097 / John & Jean Waters  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The infrastructure in the Horsleys is already overloaded. Local schools are full, medical facilities are stretched and our narrow roads cannot cope with the increased amount of traffic. If we take into account all the new properties proposed our roads will simply not be able to manage the extra volume of traffic.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/1416  Respondent: 11012129 / William Lawrence  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Although the borough supports ‘Modal Shift’ to solve transport needs there has been no viable option to realise this. No feasible alternatives have been explored particularly in reference to the traffic congestion experienced on the proposed SMC route (tramways etc.).

There has been no assessment of the impact of the proposed Railway Station at Gosden Hill. It is highly likely that this will along with the schools, retail and business developments massively increase traffic into and out of this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12481  Respondent: 11013153 / Peter Carter  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Pressure on services

1. Hospitals – The current services at the Royal Surrey appear overstretched. Significantly increasing the size of population served will further worsen both services and access. Even at this point in time getting a car parking space at the hospital is very difficult during visiting hours.
2. Schools – The current school system in Guildford is materially overstretched, hence the requirements over the past few years to expand school sites. It is not clear within the proposals that there is sufficient consideration being given to secondary school places in particular. Even with the revised changes the reality is that the schools proposed are not in the right place for demand and lack a clear strategic direction. The Council’s policy in this areas has been flawed over the past few years and the revised plan risks creating a significant continuation of the provision of lower quality schooling for many parts of Guildford with the consequence that demand is not, and will not, be evenly spread – a situation which materially increases traffic volumes and reduces community sentiment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13985  Respondent: 11014145 / John Brown  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing in response to the proposals set out for West Horsley in the 2016 Guildford Draft Local Plan. My concerns focus upon the strains that would be imposed upon an already creaking infrastructure in this area, and the erosion of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1932  Respondent: 11014401 / Peter Doyle  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15945  Respondent: 11014753 / Ian Peel  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

You have simply not considered the infrastructure needed to support your preposterous population growth plans. Our local schools, such as the Raleigh and The Howard of Effingham are already bursting at the seams. Our doctor's surgery is overloaded, as is our drainage even now when we get heavy rain. Your proposed growth is not practical, deliverable or sustainable here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/2464  Respondent: 11014881 / Linda Peters-Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy 11 - Infrastructure and Delivery

I object.

The plan targets greenfield sites which requires heavy infrastructure.

Most of the infrastructure is old and congested and cannot cope with the increased demands that will be placed upon it.

The infrastructure improvements would need to come first and the plan needs to reflect this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2079  Respondent: 11015329 / Nick Riederer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4. I object that nothing has been put forward since last year’s Consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites and thus meet National policy requirements. Every home on the West Horsley sites will need a minimum of one car to enable residents to get to shops, medical centre, library and Horsley Station, regardless of how much pressure is applied to adopt cycling and walking as the preferred means of travel a realistic estimate of 3 cars per home should be considered a minimum given the rural location and age demographics.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/172  Respondent: 11015425 / David Jenne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to strongly object to the proposed building of hundreds of houses in multiple estates around the villages of West and East Horsley. The proposed developments will put enormous strain on the infrastructure and the day-to-day life of the village.

The village does not have enough state school places locally for children at primary and secondary schools, with The Raleigh School in West Horsley and The Howard of Effingham School in Effingham are already well over-subscribed meaning many local children have to travel many miles to other schools outside the local area. I live in the same road as the Raleigh School and during the morning and afternoon school run it is almost impossible to gain access in, or out of Northcote Crescent because of dangerously cars park along the length of Northcote Road and Northcote Crescent. It is also incredibly dangerous for pedestrians at those times, most of whom are small children. In addition private schools,
Cranmore and Glenesk are well supported by children from West and East Horsley but also by families who travel to them every day from many miles away bringing in even more traffic to the village and the main A246 road.

The villages have small parades of shops in both West and East Horsley which are already too busy at most times during the week for parking and more houses are obviously going to make an already difficult situation impossible. West Horsley has no Post Office or Bank so residents have to go into East Horsley. Horsley station which is a main commuter line to London Waterloo is already severely busy 7 days a week with inadequate parking availability, particularly on Monday to Friday. With more residents it is impossible to see how additional parking facilities will be made available in the villages or at the station as there is no space to do so, which in turn will likely mean increased parking charges, which are already inexcusably high at the station.

The local Medical Centre in Kingston Avenue serves West and East Horsley and many villages further beyond the boundaries is already extremely busy. I regularly encounter difficulties getting appointments which is no doubt shared by other village residents and more houses are going to make this service unable to cope. The planned additional houses will also no doubt put strain on the Royal Surrey Hospital.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1852</th>
<th>Respondent: 11015489 / Lorraine Pipe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8746</th>
<th>Respondent: 11023009 / Julie Atkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our villages are already at capacity and cannot support any further pressure on local roads and additional congestion from proposed development. There simply is not the infrastructure in place to accommodate the local plan as it stands and as a local resident I object to the congestion that development will cause our village (policy I 1).

In the Horsleys the roads are narrow, were not intended for modern-day wider vehicles and at capacity. Pavements are lacking and in some places roads have already become extremely dangerous. Increased numbers of cyclists and through-traffic increase the danger and additional traffic numbers would make the situation critical. The roads are littered with potholes and in a constant state of repair. Key roads currently in use which eliminate pressure of Ockham Rd will either be made one way or blocked completely, making traffic congestion on main roads untenable. 5,000+ new houses in the 5 miles between the M25 and Burpham and the increased traffic would only incur additional congestion in the Horsleys and to other areas with planned development. In addition, major roads in the area such as the M25 and A3 would have to be rerouted to accommodate major proposed development such as Wisley airfield. This in turn would impact upon pollution levels around this area, which are already above accepted EU levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Congestion is already dreadful on this section of the A323 during peak hours, and these developments will undoubtedly result in gridlock, as (1,100+50 as part of 10,000) homes with the demographic of mainly young working couples with 2 children with each household having mostly 2 vehicles with adults needing cars for school run and work commute. This will give rise to approximately 21,000 additional cars (twice a day) somehow trying to thread their way) into the Guildford/Aldershot directions of the A323. Resultant queues will become legendary, and stationary car fumes/pollution will affect the whole neighbourhood adversely.

“Policy G5 (8) Traffic, Parking and Design: The visual impact of traffic and associated access and parking is minimised, especially in sensitive locations”

The noise of so many stationary vehicles with engines running (and often car audio systems blaring) will also impact each of the homes on the Guildford Road. Even without this development, I am unable to sit in my front garden, or to open any of the windows facing south towards the road.

Increased danger to children, as there will be several hundred more, all requiring access of one sort or another to the already busy A323 Guildford Road. There are currently no traffic lights or safe island crossings on my part of the Guildford Road, and so the incidence of fatalities will increase. Even if these were to be put in place, then the additional congestion would be UNTHINKABLE – making the whole scheme UNWORKABLE!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

10.1 OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11674</th>
<th>Respondent: 11024257 / Jenny Richardson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1 | Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) | I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1) Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion.
Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on their way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Roads are already congested and frequently grid-locked. Expansion of the housing stock will not sort out the problem. I moved to Guildford in 1951 when it was a delightful market town. There have been too many changes which have sadly damaged it. Careful thought needs to be given before any further expansion is made.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2892  Respondent: 11024769 / Sarah Runton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. The proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional vehicles. This will hugely increase congestion, particularly at peak times, on the narrow rural roads in Ripley, Ockham and the Horsley, and will only be exacerbated by the increase in wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV traffic.

This fundamentally contradicts the plan's assertion that the development will encourage more cyclists and pedestrians. One heavy rainfall is all it takes to cause drainage to overflow and local roads to flood. These roads were built for minimum traffic and most don't have pavements are badly lit and there is certainly no room for expansion to include any purpose built cycle lanes or designated cycle routes.

The A3 and the M25 are hugely congested at rush hour in the very area the plan proposes to build this substantial number of dwellings. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

The problem is further exacerbated by the lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

I trust that these objections will be fully considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11223  Respondent: 11028257 / David Conisbee  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of provision of local schools hospitals & doctors surgeries and the lack of provision for new roads

The local infrastructure is woefully inadequate at the present time it would collapse under any the slightest increased pressure

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1 OBJECT TO THE IMPACT ON THE INFRASTRUCTURE AROUND THE VILLAGES

- OBJECT to the impact of the Local Plan on the local infrastructure. The roads around Send and Ripley are already congested and cannot cope with the current needs. The Local Plan does not incorporate a detailed transport infrastructure strategy that would demonstrate how the road network would support the additional pressure on the roads and other amenities if the proposed development went ahead. The plans to improve the A3 are years off (2025 – 30) and, even if they were implemented, would be preceded by years of gridlock on the local roads. Plans to improve local roads (ref LRN20, specifically Send Road and Send Barns Lane) through an investment of £1.5m will be woefully inadequate to cope with the increased traffic.

Additionally, increased traffic through the villages will increase the hazards along the main roads, particularly pedestrians, especially children (using the Send School or catching buses to Guildford schools) and the increasing number of cyclists. This will be exacerbated by HGVs accessing the planned industrial units at Garlick’s Arch.

- OBJECT to Policy A43a (Land for North facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common) This would necessitate a 4-way junction at Burnt Common and would inevitably increase the amount of traffic using the local roads in Send. This junction would worsen the problem of drivers using Send as a cut through from Guildford to Woking on local roads that are just not intended for this purpose. As a resident, I am amazed that there hasn’t yet been a serious accident as drivers use Potters Lane for just this purpose with little regard for the 30mph speed limit.

- OBJECT to the proposed development of Gosden Hill Farm (Policy A25) and its inevitable impact on the roads around Send. Despite assurances of an additional railway station, commuters will utilise the opportunity to leave the A3 at the existing Burnt Common roundabout and travel on the faster Woking to Waterloo line, rather than use the slower Guildford line.

- OBJECT to the proposed developments opposite Winds Ridge (Policy A44) and Clockbarn Nursery (Policy A42) due to the impact that the additional traffic will have on small local roads. The first of these will increase the traffic leaving Send Hill onto Potters Lane at what is already a dangerous junction on very narrow lanes. Meanwhile, Send Road is already frequently blocked by HGVs trying to turn into Tannery Lane; this can only be made worse by additional traffic using the same road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
5. Infrastructure

The existing infrastructure, particularly roads, water and drainage, are already under considerable strain. Roads and homes are increasingly subject to flooding.

The M25 junction with the A3, and surrounding roads are known traffic black spots and high pollution areas. These systems cannot sustain the impact of such a large increase in population - indeed it could be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

14.) Parking issues in local villages caused by a larger population.

15.) Local healthcare facilities becoming overwhelmed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5632  Respondent: 11029409 / John Lay  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. Specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself, too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4228  Respondent: 11029441 / David Tagg  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Re; GBC Draft Local Plan 2016

--------------------------------------

We wish to add our support to the East Horsley Parish Council letter dated 13.06.2016 which identifies the areas of concern within your proposals.
We do not intend to repeat the points as listed, but do want to record our particular concern regarding the extent of the proposed development in and around the villages of East & West Horsley.

The local facilities serving our villages are insufficient now, without adding to the situation with more housing. We appreciate development is necessary, but the proposed level appears to be excessive, given the size of the villages.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4233  Respondent: 11032705 / Mike Tarrant  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object because of the increased pressure on local facilities, Doctors, Schools etc. that 485+ homes would bring to Send. 485 new homes would generate circa half a class, the new amalgamated Send school has no capacity for these pupils. Send does not need, nor do we want a 25% increase in population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16238  Respondent: 11033057 / Jo Komisarczuk  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the local plan to the number of houses required to be built because it is not sustainable, there is no road infrastructure to accommodate such huge numbers of homes and people, nor are there the schools, doctors, dentists and hospital places to sustain such a huge increase in population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7289  Respondent: 11033249 / Evelyn Scholfield  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to register my objections to the local plan in respect of matters affecting the Horsleys and surroundings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed increase in homes of 77% in the surrounding area will have an adverse affect in several ways:

TRAFFIC: Inevitably an increase in the amount of traffic, which uses narrow roads not intended for such volumes

PARKING: Parking at the shops and station is already overloaded, with no facility to increase.

MEDICAL AND SCHOOLS: Already full to capacity and no means of increasing.

INSETTING: Removal of the Horsleys from the Greenbelt protection will leave us vulnerable to further development on additional sites.

RURAL DISTRICT CENTRE: This seems to be based on designating Budgens as a large supermarket. Not so. It is a convenience store which allows it to open all day Sunday.

I have live in East Horsley for 34 years. We moved here because of its semi-rural location, which seems to now be under threat. Building on Green belt land, if allowed, will result in one great conurbation from London to Guildford.

I object most strongly to the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13829  Respondent: 11033409 / Rebecca Fraser  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to express in the strongest possible terms my objection to the 2016 Plan. In particular I am concerned about the following, none of which appear to have been addressed by any revisions to the 2014 Draft Plan:

Schools:

Local schools are already at capacity and I am aware of several friends who have been unable to secure places at the schools closest and most convenient to them. Where will the additional children go to school? I object to the potential lack of school places.

Doctor’s Surgery:

It already takes between 7 and 14 days to obtain an appointment at the Horsley Medical Centre. With no additional medical facilities planned, this will create completely unsustainable pressure on already stretched facilities which I object to.

Local Road Network:

It seems that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well. I object to this. The local roads and parking at facilities such as Horsley station are already under significant pressure. The roads are already ridiculously busy and parking to visit the local shops already very difficult.

Traffic and Parking:
Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. I object to thousands more cars and lorries on our local roads. The impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected.

**Transport:**

Misery for commuters with full trains and nowhere to park. I object to fuller trains especially at commuter times.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13833  **Respondent:** 11033409 / Rebecca Fraser  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Policing and other emergency services:**

Greater numbers of people in the area will obviously require more police and emergency services but these have not been accounted for. I object to the local police being stretched even further than they are already.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17822  **Respondent:** 11033921 / Tim Depledge  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object - I have absolutely no faith that the council will enforce this, especially having seen similar situations, for example in the Salisbury area, where friends describe children being number 400 or so in the waiting list for swimming lessons having moved into new housing estates. I also note the word "should". There is no evidence that infrastructure will be enhanced, and in fact there is no opportunity for such growth in West and East Horsley. Hence, new housing will not be supported by new infrastructure, and hence existing residents will be made to suffer by increasing numbers of users of an already strained set of local services.

Furthermore, West Horsley's two main access points are "single file only" sandwiched between houses, hence, increased traffic will cause traffic nightmare which cannot be resolved through a CIL levy.

Only recently we have seen plots of land developed where old houses have been torn down, and new residences constructed. I am in favour of replacing dilapidated homes, but, must point out that the construction of these projects has damaged the road surfaces in the immediate vicinity. Hence, if one house construction can cause such damage to the road surfaces, imagine what 400 houses can do... Please see the image here.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:** 2016_07_18_22_25_57.pdf (1.1 MB)
Comment ID: PSLPP16/6759  Respondent: 11033985 / John Peachey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/67  Respondent: 11033985 / John Peachey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

GBC has completely failed to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and Green Belt. GBC have also failed to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1612  Respondent: 11034113 / Julia Gaudelli  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4840  Respondent: 11034817 / Nick Pycraft  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Plan due to the fact that the infrastructure of Send and Send Marsh simply cannot cope with the increased traffic and also the strain on local services such as the schools and the surgery. I urge you to abandon the Plan forthwith.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12690  Respondent: 11034881 / Amy Carter  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Pressure on services

I work with parents in the antenatal and postnatal period and repeatedly see how overstretched the Maternity Services are in Guildford. I have also seen first-hand how long waiting lists are for hospital services such as the paediatric dietician. I do not believe that the Royal Surrey has the capacity to meet demand from the planned increase in housing and population, and certainly not within Maternity and Paediatric Services. Current and future residents will suffer from a lower quality of care and longer waiting times as a result of the planned expansion.

Schools are also already under pressure from an increase in the birth rate and have already been expanded (sometimes inappropriately I feel) to help cope with this. Despite the new schools planned, I worry that there will not be the capacity to absorb the number of children living in Guildford in the future with the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6968  Respondent: 11035361 / Marion Shipman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1 states infrastructure will be secured by planning obligation, planning condition, or from other infrastructure funding, including the Community infrastructure Levy.

However, there is a completely inadequate plan for addressing the infrastructure issues I have highlighted above. Roads around Ockham Road North and East and West Horsley are already busy and narrow and could not accommodate further traffic without, in addition to pollution issues, impact on vehicle and pedestrian safety. Relevant proposed road improvements focus on the A3 and £1 million for ‘East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023’. With the number of houses proposed above but additionally the developments in Wisley and Clandon, this is clearly completely inadequate and too late.

As a health professional, the proposed expansion of Horsley Health Centre in 5-15 years is not acceptable. The number of GPs are reducing with retirements and there is no identified funding for such expansion. What provision will be made at the outset of building developments?

There are no proposals for how increased pressure on mains water, waste water, education and potential flooding will be met in the Horsley area.

In summary, I object to the plan for the reasons set out above, in particular to the proposed developments in East and West Horsley but also noting the extensive development nearby in Wisley and Clandon which doesn’t adequately
consider infrastructure issues. I must ask you to amend the Local Plan to utilise brownfield land rather than green field sites.

Finally, I also note that the plan is very similar to that proposed in 2014 and ignores most of the comments received from the consultation at that time, most of which objections to the proposals. I trust the Council will listen this time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17725  Respondent: 11036129 / George Dokimakis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

No development can be sustainable without the right infrastructure supporting it. In this we support the Council in ensuring that infrastructure is created alongside or before any development. We are also calling for innovative approaches to providing the required infrastructure such as working with existing GP services to expand current premises or create additional GP branches to support the increased development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/2169  Respondent: 11036129 / George Dokimakis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Public transport and community transport should be central to the Local Plan to alleviate congestion pressure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/2176  Respondent: 11036129 / George Dokimakis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Policy ID1.1 good point, fully support it. Including point 3.
• 4.6.29 should look at the enforcement as well as the submission of Transport Assessments and Travel plans by developers
• 4.6.30 should be reinstated like slyfield estate and make it stronger …“including parking for local residents” or “Travel Plans will be required on industrial estates or business parks in order to coordinate parking and transport needs for employees with the needs of surrounding residential areas.”

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The infrastructure cannot cope with the existing population, never mind one expanded by 20-25%.

Roads are already congested and frequently grid-locked during commute and school times. The merest accident on the A3 grid-locks the town centre due to traffic avoidance.

Sort out the infrastructure first, then consider housing expansion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services. The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value. The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem. The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceeding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the
Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable. The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints. The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model. Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods. Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan. The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network. It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below. In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5...indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton. The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”. Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided. The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR: Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road / Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3) Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8). Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14). Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Lane, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/ Millbrook junction. Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction). Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SAR, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane. Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the
effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/1007</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>11036321 / Vinciane Ollington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Congestion on the A3 and M25 trunk roads**

I object to the development of the strategic sites due to the A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.

1. **Congestion on the local village roads and lanes**

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day. For example the Newark Lane and Rose Lane junction in the center of Ripley, which at peak hours, is regularly gridlocked due to the volume of traffic, made worse when Ripley High Street (B2215) is used as a detour/ slip road when the A3 is jammed. I object to further development which will cause even greater congestion in and around our villages.

1. **Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic**

Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. For example, part of Newark Lane which was resurfaced for the 2014 Olympics cycle route and has been used subsequently for other cycling events, has had to have regular “fixes” to crumbling road surfaces and recurring potholes due to traffic volumes far in excess of the road surface quality used. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

1. **Poor air quality concerns**

Further congestion, particularly in built up residential areas will only lead to greater levels of air pollution. I object to further development, which will result a fall in the air quality.

1. **Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population**
Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems, to which I object.

1. **Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed**

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object to the further stress it will put upon existing overstretched health services.

1. **Local schooling facilities will be overwhelmed**

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new schooling, existing schools will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object to the further stress it will put upon existing overstretched schools.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I have personal experience of what happens when the sewage systems are unable to cope and an unsustainable increase in houses will only exacerbate this problem.

The proposed developments will put even more pressure on local schools and healthcare services, which are already stretched.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14590  Respondent: 11036801 / Judith Mercer  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My objection is due to the following:

- Infrastructure is not discussed as being a key issue for the rest of the plan or as a pre condition for development.
- Excessive house building in the countryside will not be supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Large developments on green field sites require heavy infrastructure investment which will be more expensive for the public to fund.
- The plan does not set out provision of adequate infrastructure as a pre condition of sustainable development. It is put in as an afterthought buried in this policy. In all aspects it is giving priority to green field development over urban and brownfield regeneration. This creates a huge burden in terms of providing all the changes needed in new roads, redesigning traffic, transport and many other services to support the necessary infrastructure. It needs major investment and CIL receipts cannot guarantee this being achieved.
- Draft CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) scale encourages use of greenfield rather than brownfield land first.
- The Council is not planning the roads before allowing thousands of houses to be built and it lacks common sense. Traffic congestion which exists now is not being dealt with and planned for never mind looking at what happens if vast housing estates are built across the borough.
- Large roads may be in the pipeline but there is no thought for the smaller local roads which have to support the new ones.
- It ignores the vital fact that the GBC is not in control of highways and permission has to be obtained by either Surrey County Council or England Highways.
- It is in short a disastrous policy for the borough and its population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy 11: Infrastructure and delivery.

Development in the Green Belt and wider countryside, should that actually be either necessary or desirable (which it is not) would have to be supported by the current infrastructure. There are no credible infrastructure funding provisions for additional development. The CILS are hardly sufficient as they are vague and lacking in scale and teeth and moreover they arrive after the event. It is necessary to build infrastructure before development takes place not as an afterthought. The whole plan must be underpinned with new or repaired: roads, water and flooding provisions, power, sewage, gas, telecommunications, bridges, schools, railway and bus services health services and so on.

The entire infrastructure is well past breaking point today. New and large developments of thousands of houses in Horsley and all the other villages with all the cumulative traffic and pollution increases would cause complete and utter collapse. In Horsley the lack of footways for example together with poor sightlines and dark and winding roads, will cause walking, motoring and cycling fatalities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14280  Respondent: 11037153 / Jason Richards  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the 2016 Draft Plan as it has no regard to additional infrastructure - like a new train service from Horsley - or additional drainage facilities which would be needed to accommodate an additional 593 houses in the Horsleys alone.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3719  Respondent: 11037921 / C. H. Morris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Fourthly, the quantum of additional dwellings proposed for the Horsleys will place an intolerable burden on local amenities – even with the current level of housing we were unable to obtain places in the local schools for our children when we returned from a period working abroad and it is routinely impossible to park at local shops. Only in the last week there was a serious car accident in East Horsley in the narrow road that traffic uses when exiting from the shops, and accessing the village hall, medical centre and playing fields. Frequently the latter area has so many cars parked on pavements etc. that disabled people are unable to pass along pavements with their small vehicles.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11164  Respondent: 11039105 / Robert and Judith Warren  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
I object. The Plan is imbalanced. The significant numbers of housing estates, particularly in rural areas are unsupported by a commensurate infrastructure investment. For the Plan to work and to prevent isolated populations overstretched existing strained resources in transport, educational, medical, energy, water, sanitation and communications, there needs to be significant further consideration of the supporting infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/196  Respondent: 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7250  Respondent: 11040193 / Jill Stevens  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Having lived in Send Marsh with my family since 1972, I have seen first hand how the schools, doctors and roads, have gradually become overloaded over the years, to the point of bursting. It is inconceivable that as a Planning Team, none of the infrastructure issues have been addressed, even though national guidelines state that development must be proportional to its locality.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15976  Respondent: 11040481 / D G Spratt  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15982  Respondent: 11040481 / D G Spratt  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. DRAINS, WATER SUPPLY, FLOOD RISK, CONGESTION

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes will lead to flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable. I must ask you to revise the housing number, and to amend the Local Plan to utilise brownfield land rather than green fields sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7337  Respondent: 11041121 / Catherine Dean  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the Plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the villages of Ripley, Send and West Clandon, the roads serving the villages will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends when hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on their way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the villages and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury to the public. In the case of West Clandon, the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one (alternating) side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements as some have to do in places in order to pass.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this Plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the Plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local Plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This Plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. Implementation is critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and Community Infrastructure Levy income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the Plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as many local doctors’ surgeries will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity with waiting times of 2 weeks to see a GP. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services. There is no provision for increasing the capacity of the Royal Surrey County Hospital, Guildford. Where is this to be assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1378  Respondent: 11041121 / Catherine Dean  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy ID1 Infrastructure – Objections

- Our residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future
- Much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support developments and for this to be in place as needed (listed in Appx. C to the Plan). Even if this happens the Plan admits …”we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes”. This will be most acutely felt at junctions but these effects have apparently not been analysed so that we don’t know the location or impact.
- We can be sure however that the cumulative effects of the developments in the north east of Guildford will have a devastating impact on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send). It is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposals in the Plan (Appx. C) will do anything to mitigate this impact. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and it is freely admitted by SCC that they have little money available.
The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be challenged in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash required to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete, even assuming there are funds to provide it.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the Green Belt and its future rendered uncertain.

All of these developments will draw very large amounts of additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to Gosden Hill schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel south and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the south and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)
- SCC’s business plan for Newlands Corner

We point out that although the A247 is classified as an A road, it has none of the characteristics because it:

- is less than 2 vehicles wide in places. Larger vehicles routinely mount the only pavement.
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge over the railway, with poor site lines
- has a dangerous junction to access the station
- has a dangerous and unlit junction with the southbound A3 on-slip road
- has a primary school accessed by narrow pavements
- is largely unlit
- is already very congested at times, more so when delays on the A3 are severe

**EXAMPLE OF FREQUENT CONGESTION ON A247**

These pictures were all taken on the same morning (attached)
In summary, the A247 is quite unsuited to coping with additional traffic and it is very clear that the developments proposed in the 2017 Local Plan will increase the amount of traffic on this road over and above that in the 2016 draft to which residents strongly objected. There is nothing in the Infrastructure Schedule which addresses this issue. Indeed several of the infrastructure proposals will themselves lead to significant increases in traffic on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: lp.jpg (299 KB)
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5370  Respondent: 11041857 / Catherine Carr  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Comments on the Proposed Submission Local Plan

I have read the proposed submission local plan which GBC have now published for local consultation. I would like to say that I support many of the objectives within the document and fully recognise the need to build additional housing and to share this across the Borough.

However I have three specific areas that I have concerns about where I feel that the document does not address particular local issues or that it makes decisions based on misleading assumptions.
Infrastructure – the proposals do not address in any way the current backlog of needs within the Borough and specifically East Horsley and similar villages and seem to assume that development money will fund the major investment in infrastructure (medical centres, schools, roads, drainage etc.) that is required for the new housing planned.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5373  Respondent: 11041857 / Catherine Carr  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure Policies

The section in the Proposed Submission Local Plan sets out a range of infrastructure policies.

A number of these give me cause for concern both generally across GBC where extensive housing development is proposed, but also specifically to East Horsley (and similar local villages). I am the chair of both the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and the lead for Infrastructure. It is evident that:

• The Medical Centre is at capacity in terms of numbers of patients and difficulty in booking appointment. This is included in HSC5 but is not prioritised within the timescale of the Local Plan and I would support that this be brought within a 0 – 5 year timescale;

• The Raleigh Primary School which is the state school that most East Horsley children attend is currently oversubscribed and has waiting lists for all years. This is not mentioned within the draft Local Plan although currently the school is proposing that it could move to a different site within West Horsley which would permit expansion. I would support that this be included within the Local Plan.

In terms of roads, pavements, and flooding there are regular major problems in terms of:

• Managing the current volume of traffic, especially the HGVs that increasingly use the roads to access the M3 and M25;
• Living with the poor quality and maintenance of current drains that regularly become blocked and flood; and
• Using pavements that are narrow and uneven or damaged so that people in wheelchairs, or pushing pushchairs are unable to safely use them to access facilities.

Appendix C includes one other proposal for East Horsley. LPN25 a traffic management and environmental improvement scheme with no details and the assumption that this will be funded at least partly from developer contribution. This uncertainty about funding means that there will remain uncertainty and difficulty with any forward planning for issues that need to be addressed within a shorter time frame.

An added issue is that the Local Plan does not take account of the impact on a currently overstretched infrastructure of the housing developments within both East and West Horsley and potentially Wisley, as many commuters will use the two railways stations within the village with a consequent impact on roads usage and demand on other facilities.

I would call your attention to a report by McKinsey Global Institute (The Times 27th June 2016) which concluded that Britain has a 0.4% gap between its estimated requirement for infrastructure needs before 2030 and its current spending.

GBC’s Local Plan has a fifteen year timeframe and it seems imperative that it fully addresses the need for investment in infrastructure both to meet the current shortfall and to support further development.
I accordingly object to the infrastructure proposals on the grounds that they do not address the current need to meet deficiencies in infrastructure. I also object to the proposals in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11555  Respondent: 11042433 / Sam Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

Ripley and Send schools are now also at full capacity and would require expansion or additional schools being built. There is also no secondary schooling available in Ripley, Send and Clandon without sizable commutes by car due to lack of bus service provisions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12715</th>
<th>Respondent: 11042433 / Sam Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time such as Polesden Lane. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

Ripley and Send schools are now also at full capacity and would require expansion or additional schools being built. There is also no secondary schooling available in Ripley, Send and Clandon without sizable commutes by car due to lack of bus service provisions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the failure of the Council to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the Guildford urban area, which must be targeted first for development before countryside and the Green Belt. I also object to the failure of the Council to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5503  **Respondent:** 11043553 / Geraldine Banks  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

---

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---

1. **POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get
worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14602  **Respondent:** 11044129 / Christopher Barrass  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2815  Respondent: 11044353 / Michael Frayn  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13761  Respondent: 11044353 / Michael Frayn  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I1

The density of housing proposed cannot be supported by the existing infrastructure, and no provision has been made for the increased pressure on services. In particular the schools which are already over subscribed, and medical provision which can barely accommodate the existing population.

It is regarded as a necessity for households in rural areas to have two cars, more so in an area with a limited public transport provision, the resulting increase in traffic would place an unreasonable burden on narrow country roads, and exacerbate existing problems experienced by residents. The area is promoted as a location for the increasingly popular activity of cycling, which already causes frustration to current residents trying to go about their business.

New development is required to respect the character and density of housing in the area, and be limited by the availability if infrastructure and local facilities, the plan fails to do so.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6753  Respondent: 11045601 / Chloe Hartwell  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Services

Horsley’s services are at breaking point already. Getting a prompt appointment at our medical centre can be difficult and their drop-in clinics always seem to be oversubscribed. The village primary school is oversubscribed, with many village children having to travel to other villages already. The proposed number of new houses/residents will have a knock on effect for the Howard of Effingham secondary school which has outgrown its current sight and plans to expand it seem to be being blocked. Such a huge number of new residents cannot be sustained without significant investment in these and other local services.

Infrastructure

Our roads are in an appalling condition already. I have young children and like to walk around the village with a pushchair as much as possible. This is already a hazardous occupation as the pavements are so narrow and letting my children walk, scoot or ride bikes is out of the question in some parts of the village. More people on our roads and pavements will be dangerous and cause accidents.

Whilst parking at our local conveniences is currently adequate, with more local residents this would become a problem. I understand that you have been advised by Thames Water that our waste water drainage system is already under strain and this can be seen each time we have heavy rainfall. Localised flooding is common as the drainage system is not able to cope.

Huge investment is already required in these areas, before even small housing developments can possibly be considered.

Pollution

My husband and I moved to West Horsley from London in order to escape the pollution levels, we specifically chose a small village for this reason. I object to this small village being turned into a town, being taken out of the Green Belt, and the levels of pollution which would thus ensue

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Just because the villages in Surrey have relatively good transport links to London does not mean they should now try to support significantly more people than the infrastructure can handle, at the end of the day we know this is about making money and not about providing affordable housing for the youngsters of tomorrow. Do we want to live in a country like the USA where the ecological consequences of low-density suburban living are becoming more obvious year on year (The House of commons briefing paper Number 00934, 5 January 2016) Tristan Hunt stated that economic factors are significantly depleted by uncontrolled urban sprawl and really is this the legacy we want to give to Surrey in the future?

The Raleigh school has just posted a letter through my door stating that they wish to move to a Greenfield site on East lane, replacing the existing school so that housing can replace the old site. Currently I live adjacent to this school, it is currently a great school on a nice plot that has access to open areas for children to play at break time, and Weston Lea for
sports days etc. If this proposed plan goes ahead it will mean the selling off of Weston Lea, so no school sports day facilities, and the site proposed for the new school would mean the whole of East lane would be blocked to traffic during school pick up and drop off times, just like Glenesk school, rendering the whole village a no go zone for all concerned. At least currently it’s only outside of my house on Northcote Crescent that is a real burden on the community. It is true that the school is at capacity and has been for many years, the plan mentions providing additional classes each year to accommodate the influx of pupils by the new housing developments, which the current school cannot accommodate in its current state. If the new houses were given planning permission it would impact both the Raleigh and the Howard of Effingham. There are no details of how traffic will be managed in the plan, improvements to existing roads which are atrocious currently, or any increase in local infrastructure such as doctors surgeries, improvements to water drainage, internet improvement, or mobile phone facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and The Clandons are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper or any pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

I object as without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Transport

The rural location of these sites necessitates the use of a car.

Public transport links within the two villages rely on a very infrequent bus service, and the train line.

The train station has no step-free access for trains running London bound, or returning from Guildford, limiting accessibility to those who find a bridge restrictive (such as the frail or elderly) and preventing access for those in wheelchairs or with small children who require prams and buggies. The advertised step free access route per national rail requires getting off a stop early (or late) and 'catching a taxi from Clandon'.

Access to private transport, such as a car, is therefore a necessity for anyone in these groups.

Even for those who walking over a bridge is no impediment, the lack of sufficient amenities within the village mean that frequent travel out of the village is required (for food, leisure etc) which undoubtedly will require a car.

Even more significant is the development on Wisley airfield. The site is largely isolated from public transport, without any pedestrian or dedicated cycle routes to the train station. The significant majority of residents would need access to a car.

The volume of additional cars from these planned developments will increase road usage and the following infrastructure improvements would be required as a minimum:

Access to the villages is through two routes: ‘The Street’ through West Horsley and B2039 through East Horsley. Both of these roads have stretches where the road narrows to such an extent that there is not sufficient space for two highway lanes, and road markings disappear. In order to allow the higher volumes of cars pass one-another, the roads will need to be widened to accommodate the increased volume of traffic.
A3 junction. During rush hour (between roughly 7am to 9am Monday to Thursday during term time), the stretch of the A3 northbound between the Wisley junction and the M25 exit frequently ceases to a halt under the weight of traffic. This has a knock-on effect to the northbound side of the A3, with traffic extending south beyond Burpham. Cars joining at this junction and not wishing to join the M25 have to filter across the traffic looking to exit, which contributes to the congestion. The additional high volume of traffic joining as a result of the proposed developments will result in further delays. This junction will need major improvement works to prevent sever disruption to the highways.

**Drainage / Sewerage**

The sewerage within the village already experiences problems, and investment will be required to accommodate additional discharge from the high density developments. Some improvement works are scheduled but will not commence before the proposed housing development is in place. The proposed plans do not address this issue or how they will prevent any nuisance before or during the improvement works have taken place.

**Flooding**

There are areas within the village which are within flood zones 2 and 3, measures are required to ensure current housing does not become more prone to flooding, and water can drain freely (see drainage above).

**Car parking**

Car parking is restricted in the village, often resulting in difficulty to find a space outside the village shops. The extension of an additional 35% housing will require corresponding increases in the car parking provisions within the village (see also the point made earlier that due to limited pavement and transport one has to rely on a car in the villages).

**Medical facilities**

There are only possible proposals to extend the Kingston Avenue Medical Centre. This medical facility is already extremely busy, and an extension at least in proportion to the increase in residents is required to ensure that all village residents have access to essential healthcare services.

Due to proposed additional residents served by the Royal Surrey County Hospital, a major extension would be required.

**Schools**

The local plan does not address the additional expansion of educational services required to meet the needs of the extra residents. Currently schools and educational services already experience waiting lists. There is one comprehensive school (Raleigh) within the village which is already full. This will need corresponding investment to enable extension to accommodate the significant number of additional residents.

Given the main secondary school within the area, Howard of Effingham, will have a significant volume of additional houses within its wider catchment area (which is not just limited to East and West Horsley), provisions desperately need to be increased to ensure that sufficient education is available for the larger population.

---

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
The plan in my opinion fails to deal with the following infrastructure issues:

- **Schools**: The Raleigh school is the main state primary in the area and is already oversubscribed for every year. Currently this means that many children have to travel significantly further to access a state primary school, despite living in walking distance to The Raleigh School. It was only a few years ago that the school had to build additional classrooms to meet the demand for places. The school is already fully enclosed by houses on all sides, so further development is not an option. The Howard of Effingham Secondary School is also at full capacity.

- **Roads and pavements**: With the proposed number of new houses to be built, this makes for a huge increase in traffic, particularly as most households have 2 cars. All roads running through East and West Horsley already experience high levels of traffic, which results in speeding being a safety concern through the villages. Major congestion is also already seen around the three schools (Raleigh, Glenesk and Cranmore), at both drop off and pick up times. The condition of the roads is currently unacceptable, with major potholes and defects in all of the village’s roads. More cars are only going to exaggerate the situation. The pavements are unfortunately in poor condition too, making walking for the elderly and people with children and buggies quite dangerous at times. The roads around the village are already narrow, so widening is just not an option. Therefore any major population increase is just not compatible with the current roads and pavements.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
around the shops. The current condition of the roads is far from desirable and although I understand council budgets are under extreme pressure, significant increases in traffic is not going to help this situation.

Like the roads, the village pavements are in disrepair and can be difficult (and dangerous at night) to use with pushchairs. Although the pavements could be repaired, there is no room for them to be widened in order to handle the increased footfall.

During periods of heavy rain, many of the roads within the village become flooded. This problem would be a lot worse if there weren’t adjacent fields for the water to run-off onto. Building on a number of these fields could potentially lead to significant flooding within the village. The existing waste water system struggles even now and Thames Water has already said that it would not be able to cope with any additional demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12975  **Respondent:** 11047873 / Mary Waldner  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is **Sound?** ( ), is **Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. **POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.
This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
If it were to be shown that in fact the destruction of the Horsley villages, along with Ockham and their local countryside can be justified legally by simply re-writing the laws governing the Green Belt, then I would further object to the plans on the grounds of a severe lack of infrastructure, either currently available or planned.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1469  Respondent: 11047969 / Richard Poppe  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As far as I can see the changes, so far as they affect West Horsley, while to be welcomed, are very minor and do not materially change the situation regarding the sheer number of houses to be built in the village, and also in the surrounding villages. he very obvious consideration of the complete overload of all the infrastructure in this area remains a clear and total block to the plans. It is quite clear to everyone I discuss this with that shops, schools, medical facilities and all the other amenities which manage to cope with the current population density will become swamped to the detriment of everyone.

[One or more sections of this comment have been removed because they did not relate to a change to the plan.]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/673  Respondent: 11048289 / Susanna Harrington  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Disproportionate housing development would cause chaos to already oversubscribed schools and railway station car parks. There is already a problem with pedestrian and cyclist safety on crowded roads with no pavements or paths. The cycle lanes are just a joke, far too narrow and peter out just as they are most needed at junctions and roundabouts.

There is a lack of local buses and the infrastructure is simply not there.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/613  Respondent: 11048353 / Lynda Hill  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I appreciate that there should be housing but not to the extent proposed. Our village infrastructure can not cope with the volume suggested.

137 houses on Manor farm of 16% density. Ridiculous.

Same for another large site on Waterloo farm.

Some appreciation for the dramatic impact on schools, roads resources needs thinking about and reevaluating.

I object to this plan

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7570</th>
<th>Respondent: 11049473 / Victor Bates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment...
without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12836  **Respondent:** 11053825 / Claire Owen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>is Sound?</th>
<th>is Legally Compliant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however,
assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically
dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a
key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large
infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing
conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns
over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if
at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been
identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing
residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and
sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages
Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon
existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will
stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/989</th>
<th>Respondent: 11053825 / Claire Owen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure
(Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose
Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will
cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving
capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for
only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a
further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around
these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9604  Respondent: 11053889 / Claire Handley  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECTION TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY) AND POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY): - the Council have failed to consider and take proper account of existing and increased pressures on infrastructure in setting out its development plans. The proposed and excessive housebuilding in our rural communities and countryside / green belt land is not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure which is a key flaw in the Plan. The Council have failed to provide any plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone capacity to accommodate the huge increase in demand / burden once thousands of houses are built across the countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12326  Respondent: 11054049 / Clare Goodall  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Flooding is endemic in the area of north Surrey, further developments adjacent to flood plains for example site A42 Clockbarn Nursery will create further flooding issues both for the new developments and existing properties. The lessons of developments on flood plains should be learnt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17087  Respondent: 11060065 / Meredith Hopkins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am concerned about the impact this will have on Traffic - The Horsleys are semi-rural, spring-line villages with rural road systems dating back to 14th Century property boundaries - just after the Black Death. The roads are narrow, winding and flood regularly. Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially more 1100 more cars within the villages, and 6000 new vehicles within a three mile radius of the villages. New residents of Wisley, Ockham and Ripley will need to travel into the middle of East Horsley or to Effingham for train connections. The impact of this increase in traffic on our local road infrastructure will be unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17089  Respondent: 11060065 / Meredith Hopkins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am concerned about the impact this will have on our Schools - Local primary schools are already at capacity and, if news reports are to be believed, there will be a severe shortage of places over the coming decade, even before there is any new development. Only three years ago, pupils from Horsley were told that there were no places for them at the local senior school so special provision had to be made. According to the new plan, despite the large increase in the number of households, no extra school places are planned in the Horsleys. Where are the children of these households supposed to go to school? The primary school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not be available until years into the project and, as yet, there is no plan for a new secondary school.

I am concerned about the impact this will have on our Medical facilities - We have a very good medical centre where it is, unfortunately, not unusual to have to wait three weeks to see a named GP. The addition of 500+ new households will only exacerbate this problem.
I have already stated that I do not object to development in itself but the current proposals are out of all proportion to the current communities.

Implementation of these proposals would irrevocably alter the nature of the communities.

Implementation of these proposals would overburden the community infrastructure.

Implementation of these proposals would not address the real areas of housing need.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14246  Respondent: 11061185 / Peter Komisarczuk  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that other than a slip road onto the A3 at Burnt Common – to which I object as it will attract more traffic to this area and cause more congestion (although it might reduce traffic going through Ripley towards the A3 junction at Wisley. You are simply moving the problem around not fixing it.

The rural roads in this area are often very narrow, in poor condition and often have no footpaths. It is madness to risk pedestrians lives or health with all these new homes – I believe it means dangerous and unsustainable traffic. I have not seen detailed modelling of the affect of this development on the road infrastructure - how can you proceed without sufficient systematic and scientific evidence and good modelling going through the entire development plan and through to 5 years after completion?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14253  Respondent: 11061185 / Peter Komisarczuk  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough. Surely someone must have considered that this might be necessary and should therefore be
I have previously objected to the proposed development at Wisley and this new Plan does not address the issues raised.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Policy ID1 – The transport aspects of the Plan cannot be regarded as sound. The Plan provides a vivid description of the conditions on the network today and the evidence is that these will be as poor, and in some cases worse, at the end of the plan period, even with the mitigation measures. The evidence provided indicates that congestion will be widespread on much of the highway network in peak periods, even with the proposed highway schemes and with the measures to encourage the use of public transport in place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

The local infrastructure is overstretched and the enormity of the proposed developments are infeasible. Projecting a potential future of poorer and few resources for those living in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

5. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. The bends and narrow width of the road in West Clandon make the road difficult to access from some of the 100 or so houses, businesses and amenities with entrances onto the road (e.g. Onslow Arms pub, Clandon railway station). The same difficulty is experienced by pedestrians and the fact that there is only a footpath on one side of the road makes it impossible to improve safety for pedestrians crossing the road in many places. These problems will become worse with increased traffic.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2420  Respondent: 11070113 / Alison Hague  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future

• Much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support developments and for this to be in place as needed (listed in Appx. C to the Plan). Even if this happens the Plan admits …“we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes”. This will be most acutely felt at junctions but these effects have apparently not been analysed so that we don’t know the location or impact.

• We can be sure however that the cumulative effects of the developments in the north east of Guildford will have a devastating impact on the A247 through the village of West Clandon (and of course on Send). It is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposals in the Plan (Appx. C) will do anything to mitigate this impact. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and it is freely admitted by SCC that they have little or no money available.

• The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see C). I question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be challenged in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash required to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete, even assuming there are funds to provide it.

• If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the Green Belt and its future rendered uncertain.

• All of these developments will draw very large amounts of additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to Gosden Hill schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel south and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the south and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)
- SCC’s business plan for Newlands Corner
I would like to point out that although the A247 is classified as an A road, it has none of the characteristics because it:

- is less than 2 vehicles wide in places. Larger vehicles routinely mount the only pavement.
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has a footpath only on one side of the road in long sections, including sections with pub, care home and church car park
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge over the railway, with poor sight lines
- has other entrances with poor sight lines (eg Onslow Arms, church car park)
- has a dangerous junction to access the station
- has a dangerous and unlit junction with the southbound A3 on-slip road
- has a primary school accessed by narrow pavements
- is largely unlit
- is already very congested at times, more so when delays on the A3 are severe

The A247 is in reality a residential road with numerous bends, narrow sections and side-entrances. The road through West Clandon already has numerous accident black spots, such as: (I) the exit from Clandon station which has extremely poor sight lines due to a humped back bridge where numerous accidents have occurred; (ii) the exit from the Onslow Arms pub which is almost blind due to the pub building being adjacent the road - a vehicle has recently ended up in the garden of the cottage opposite; (iii) the narrow section outside “Summers” which is regularly littered with the wing mirrors of cars which have made contact, as well as being a dangerous area for pedestrians due to vehicles mounting the pavement to try to pass; (iv) the winding section outside Clandon Regis and near the primary school which regularly suffers from demolition of gate posts and fences as vehicles leave the road; (v) the bend near West Clandon church which has seen damage caused to the flint wall in recent years.

In summary, the A247 is quite unsuited to coping with additional traffic and it is very clear that the developments proposed in the 2017 Local Plan will increase the amount of traffic on this road over and above that in the 2016 draft to which residents strongly objected. There is nothing in the Infrastructure Schedule which addresses this issue. Indeed several of the infrastructure proposals will themselves lead to significant increases in traffic on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel south and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the south and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

-is less than 2 vehicle wide in places. Larger vehicles routinely mount the (only) pavement to pass one another in the narrow sections.

-does not have continuous footpaths

- has a footpath only on one side of the road in long sections, including sections with pub, care home and church car park
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor sight lines
- has other entrances with poor sight lines (eg Onslow Arms, church car park)
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school

-is already very congested at times, more so when delays on the A3 are severe, which is common in the evening rush hours (4pm to 630pm) and summer weekends

-cuts through the Conservation Area of West Clandon within which 19 listed buildings are located with road frontage. A further 9 listed buildings are located on the A247 in West Clandon north of the Conservation Area.

The A247 is in reality a residential road with numerous bends, narrow sections and side-entrances. The road through West Clandon already has numerous accident black spots, such as: (I) the exit from Clandon station which has extremely poor sight lines due to a humped back bridge where numerous accidents have occurred; (ii) the exit from the Onslow Arms pub which is almost blind due to the pub building being adjacent the road - a vehicle has recently ended up in the garden of the cottage opposite; (iii) the narrow section outside “Summers” which is regularly littered with the wing mirrors of cars which have made contact, as well as being a dangerous area for pedestrians due to vehicles mounting the pavement to try to pass; (iv) the winding section outside Clandon Regis and near the primary school which regularly suffers from demolition of gate posts and fences as vehicles leave the road; (v) the bend near West Clandon church which has seen damage caused to the flint wall in recent years.

Increased traffic through West Clandon would make it difficult for people to move around the village both as pedestrians and in cars, a problem exacerbated by the many bends in the A247 in the village and by the long sections where there is only room for a footpath on one side of the road.
In short the A247 is too narrow and has too many bends to cope with increased traffic without compromising safety of cars, pedestrians and cyclists.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8843  Respondent: 11071553 / Nicholas Roberts  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY) – I object. Adequate infrastructure should be a precondition of the whole plan, not a footnote buried away deep in the plan as it is here. This policy can’t hide that there are no funds of plans for the infrastructure needed to support the overambitious plans for big housing estates spread across the Guildford Green Belt.

Why not spare the countryside and build in town instead? I just don’t believe that not enough brownfield urban sites exist. First of all because the council hasn’t bothered to catalogue it. Secondly because this policy does nothing to prioritise its use through the CIL structure.

Developing brownfield sites is so much easier and cheaper for the public because much of the infrastructure already exists. But this policy kow-tows to developers who find green fields cheaper.

There are no contingency plans here for the traffic increase caused by the planned thousands of houses across the countryside. Because housing and road planning are sequenced back to front, Green Belt will be lost before road are improved – if indeed they ever are, since there is no funding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17746  Respondent: 11071649 / Martin Southcott  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am fully supportive of the responses submitted by the Guildford Residents Association about the above.

I wish to emphasise my concern about:

the lack of suitable infrastructure for the massive increase in housing and town expansion proposed. Current infrastructure is already woefully inadequate, and the provision of new should be binding and phased in advance of expansion. I strongly support the concept and full investigation of the GVG’s additional bridge over river and railway. Any new station development must address this.

the risk of flooding in a large number of key areas of the Borough

Protected wildlife areas
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12391</th>
<th>Respondent: 11074465 / Louise Vaughan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY II**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements, as they have to do to pass at narrow sections.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green Belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.
Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the Plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This Plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key constraint, the Plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send, will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17457  Respondent: 11079361 / Alan Dillon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In general, it is very important that adequate provision is made for all necessary improved infrastructure to be put in place before, or concurrently with, new developments. I refer in particular to roads, water, sewage, main drainage and electricity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14345  Respondent: 11080097 / David & Julia Hunt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services. The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value. The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem. The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor
development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceeding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable. The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints. The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model. Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods. Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan. The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network. It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below. In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5..indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton. The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”. Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided. The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR: Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road/Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3) Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (para 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8). Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14) Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction. Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction). Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane. Town Centre – the report has very little to say
about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2916  Respondent: 11086433 / Colin Carmichael  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15060  Respondent: 11095905 / Joanna Holden  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Highways England have already indicated that the A3 is at overcapacity, having objected to further parking at the Royal Surrey County Hospital on the grounds that it would increase traffic problems on the Any proposed development outside the town boundary will just put further pressure on the local road network.

1. I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope and there are already problems with GP access and school places.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2580  Respondent: 11095905 / Joanna Holden  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Any development in and around Send will need to take into account the lack of public transport at commuting times of day and allow for multiple vehicles for each house or development- leading to an exponential increase in traffic in an already busy and over stretched road area and would lead to further instances of gridlock.

There is no provision for schools, road improvement or other services such as GP services in the Send area where such services are already at breaking point. Until the services are improved there should be no further development.

Surface flooding is already a problem in the Send area. While much of the village is slightly above the current flood plain, this is marginal and roads are subject to surface flooding as a result of existing development. Any further development in and around the village will increase both the flooding and surface water flooding risks.

We have recently received notification from the local water supplier that water supplies are under pressure after a drier than usual winter. That is with current levels of building. Any further building and development in the area will both increase the demand for water while increasing the flood risk and decreasing the amount of water entering the ground and thus leading to aquifer depletion and drought risk.

Overall, the changes to the Local Plan are disproportionately increasing development in Send and the surrounding area at the expense of the Green Belt while ignoring the large stock of brownfield sites within Guildford itself. Those sites should be used before any development on Green Belt or before removing areas from the Green Belt for development.

We strongly object to these changes to the Local Plan and urge that they be rejected and the development moved to brownfield sites, of which the borough has an ample sufficiency.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4687  Respondent: 11096897 / Rob Workman  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
A further worry with all sites is that if the plan goes ahead there is unlikely to be much in the way of affordable housing, and consequently there will be an influx of high earning commuters which will continue to change the nature of the villages. This will add to the local traffic problem and on a wider scale the A3 and M25 roads will be subjected to increasing congestion at a time when for parts of the day both of these roads are unable to cope comfortably with traffic volumes. There will be further problems with other amenities. The area is not blessed with unlimited school places, the Medical Centre in East Horsley is fully stretched and it will be necessary to massively improve the drainage system.

The Hotel site (A36) is very near to Horsley Towers and is likely to be extremely visible. The roadway around is potentially dangerous.

The four sites clustered around the Raleigh School area (A38, A39, A40 and A41) would be a total of 445 homes. This would constitute an enormous increase in the size of the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/299  Respondent: 11096897 / Rob Workman  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Being connected with West Horsley for over 60 years and living in the village since the year 2000, seeing what is proposed fills me with concern. My grandparents, who actually owned and ran the village newagents in the 1940s, would be dismayed to find that our local shops have dwindled and no longer is it easy to visit a post office or buy essential groceries.

The residents of the 40 new homes lined up for the Bell and Colvill site (A37) adjacent to the old village parade of shops will no longer have the convenience of shopping facilities on their doorstep.

East Horsley would increase massively should the 445 homes clustered around the Raleigh School area (A38, A39, A40 and A41) be built. The infrastructure to cope is certainly not in place.

Difficulties ahead continue to mount if the Draft Plan for the Horsleys is implemented. Local roads are already overcrowded and at peak times the congestion is so bad that an increase in traffic, which will certainly result if the Plan for the Horsleys and other developments in the offing come to fruition, will bring local roads and the A3 to a standstill. Furthermore, the Horsley Medical Practice, which is already under strain, will have to increase its waiting times for an appointment and local schools will quickly fill, resulting in long treks to alternative suitable schools, if any can be found. The entire drainage system will be swamped.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15863  Respondent: 11098369 / Neil & Nicki Covington  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

WE OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

WE OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

WE OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1).

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. We have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
It already takes between 7 and 14 days to obtain an appointment at the Horsley Medical Centre. With no additional medical facilities planned, this will create completely unsustainable pressure on already stretched facilities.

Local Road Network:

It seems that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well. The local roads and parking at facilities such as Horsley station are already under significant pressure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15534   Respondent: 11104033 / David Dutton   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. The bends and narrow width of the road in West Clandon make the road difficult to access from some of the 100 or so houses, businesses and amenities with entrances onto the road (e.g. Onslow Arms pub, Clandon railway station). The same difficulty is experienced by pedestrians and the fact that there is only a footpath on one side of the road makes it impossible to improve safety for pedestrians crossing the road in many places. These problems will become worse with increased traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2366   Respondent: 11104033 / David Dutton   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
1. Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future measures.

2. Much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support developments and for this to be in place as needed (listed in Appx. C to the Plan). Even if this happens the Plan admits …”we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes”. This will be most acutely felt at junctions but these effects have apparently not been analysed so that we don’t know the location or impact.

3. We can be sure however that the cumulative effects of the developments in the north east of Guildford will have a devastating impact on the A247 through the village of West Clandon (and of course on Send). It is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposals in the Plan (Appx. C) will do anything to mitigate this impact. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and it is freely admitted by SCC that they have little money available.

4. The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see C). I question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be challenged in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash required to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete, even assuming there are funds to provide it.

5. If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the Green Belt and its future rendered uncertain.

6. All of these developments will draw very large amounts of additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to Gosden Hill schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel south and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel south and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the south and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)
- SCC’s business plan for Newlands Corner

I would like to point out that although the A247 is classified as an A road, it has none of the characteristics because it:

- is less than 2 vehicles wide in places. Larger vehicles routinely mount the only pavement.
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has a footpath only on one side of the road in long sections, including sections with pub, care home and church car park
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge over the railway, with poor sight lines
- has other entrances with poor sight lines (eg Onslow Arms, church car park)
- has a dangerous junction to access the station
- has a dangerous and unlit junction with the southbound A3 on-slip road
- has a primary school accessed by narrow pavements
- is largely unlit
- is already very congested at times, more so when delays on the A3 are severe

The A247 may be an A-road on the map but in reality it is a residential road with numerous bends, narrow sections and side-entrances. The road through West Clandon already has numerous accident black spots, such as: (I) the exit from Clandon station which has extremely poor sight lines due to a humped back bridge where numerous accidents have occurred; (ii) the exit from the Onslow Arms pub which is almost blind due to the pub building being adjacent the road - a vehicle has recently ended up in the garden of the cottage opposite; (iii) the narrow section outside “Summers” which is regularly littered with the wing mirrors of cars which have made contact, as well as being a dangerous area for pedestrians due to vehicles mounting the pavement to try to pass; (iv) the winding section outside Clandon Regis and near the primary school which regularly suffers from demolition of gate posts and fences as vehicles leave the road; (v) the bend near West Clandon church which has seen damage caused to the flint wall in recent years.

In summary, the A247 is quite unsuited to coping with additional traffic and it is very clear that the developments proposed in the 2017 Local Plan will increase the amount of traffic on this road over and above that in the 2016 draft to which residents strongly objected. There is nothing in the Infrastructure Schedule which addresses this issue. Indeed several of the infrastructure proposals will themselves lead to significant increases in traffic on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Cladon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Cladon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Cladon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Traffic volume, the roads in the above mentioned areas already struggle with the burden of traffic, the roads being in a state of disrepair.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local
Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1132</th>
<th>Respondent: 11151617 / Nigel Tallick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11848</th>
<th>Respondent: 11153313 / Milena Nicholas</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overprovision of housing in the Plan which will lead to highway congestion together with excessive strain on the infrastructure including the RSCH and other medical and educational facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2399</th>
<th>Respondent: 11157345 / John Harrison</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please take into account the following comments on the local plan.

At the local meeting I went to, Paul Spooner emphasised that all the major strategic development was contingent on major infrastructure improvement. This is not sufficiently clear in his forward to the plan. Paragraph 4, for instance, it should be unequivocal and say something like the existing infrastructure in the borough is under severe pressure: traffic congestion is 12 highest in Europe and there is very little capacity for increased electricity consumption. In order not to exacerbate the current shortcomings no significant new development will be permitted until the necessary finance for increasing the capacity of local roads including in particular the A3 and Guildford town centre one-way system has been secured and implementation timetabled.
This will ensure that the developers have realistic expectations as to when sites can be brought forward and avoid the risk that the proviso to plan gets overlooked in the future.

Paragraph 2.15 is a statement of the obvious. It can take two hours to cross from one side of Guildford to the other which is totally unacceptable and imposes huge diseconomies, social costs and additional pollution. It should be amended to read: “There is an urgent requirement to increase the proportion of trips undertaken on a sustainable basis notwithstanding the anticipated increase in population. The council will encourage cycling, walking and the use of public transport and discourage inefficient use of the private motorcar by all means possible including consideration of congestion charging, encouraging car sharing, discouraging single occupancy use and working with local schools to substantially reduce the number of children dropped off by car, and to explore the possibility of specific school-related traffic management initiatives and, particularly in the morning rush hour, such as short-term one way streets or temporary closure to through traffic of critical residential roads used for the “school run”.

Similarly, 2.22. To say that the infrastructure is experiencing additional stress in no way conveys how overloaded the road system in particular is. There must be sufficient quantitative data to demonstrate just how unacceptable the existing situation is nevermind the possibility of adding to it.

Other terms of the size understanding of Guildford had bypasses created in the 1970’s, 1980s and 1990s. Guilford was introduced in the 1930s since when traffic volumes have increased beyond all expectations. On any objective Analysis Guildford is in need of an additional bypass. In normal circumstances this would take the form of a southern loop to create a circle around the urban area but this is not possible given the attractive and protected nature of the countryside. The idea of the tunnel therefore beneath the existing A3 could be an excellent solution. The notion of simply widening the existing A3 Will have a lot of detrimental environmental impacts. For example, living here we are 2 miles from the A3 but we can still hear the roar of the traffic from the out of town section which lacks sound absorbing tarmac and due to the prevailing wind direction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2405  Respondent: 11157345 / John Harrison  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The housing table in the appendix sets out clear housing targets but the fact that these are dependent upon prior infrastructure improvements is not equally clear. It seems to me that there is every possibility that the numbers in the table will be seized upon and the proviso will be forgotten. There is also a very real risk that construction of the houses will be commenced in anticipation of the improved infrastructure which will subsequently be cancelled. This cannot be allowed to happen and this risk must be totally eradicated in the way the plan is written.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2018  Respondent: 11160001 / Andy Freebody  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16312  **Respondent:** 11182849 / Ian Featherstone  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

- Flooding is endemic in the area of north Surrey, further developments adjacent to flood plains for example site A42 Clockbarn Nursery will create further flooding issues both for the new developments and existing properties. The lessons of developments on flood plains should be learnt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15987  **Respondent:** 11183809 / Robinson Escott Planning LLP (Joe Alderman)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

We act for Crimson Project Management. This representation relates to the

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY - Policy 11 and INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEDULE - Appendix C.**

The Consultation Draft Guildford Borough Local Plan July 2014 identified a need for a new five form entry secondary school to the north of Guildford. A site for the school was proposed to be allocated at Salt Box Road, Guildford.

The Regulation 19 Submission Draft has deleted this proposed allocation. Instead, Item SED3 of Appendix C identifies a seven form entry secondary school allocation at a strategic site at Normandy/Flexford. The proposed new secondary school is to be located close to Wanborough Railway Station. It is stated that only one form of entry would be required to serve the strategic development itself, with the remaining capacity serving the wider area, including the Blackwell Farm strategic site.

Crimson Project Management has recently submitted a planning application for a mixed use development which would include a new five form entry secondary school as part of a sustainable urban extension to Fairlands which is in a significantly more sustainable location to serve the needs of north Guildford, the wider area and any further development that may take place at Blackwell Farm and/or Normandy/Flexford.

Attached to this letter is a comparative analysis of the sustainability merits of the respective proposed locations for both the new school and new housing of the Rokers/Fairlands development and the Normandy/Flexford development. The conclusions of the analysis demonstrate that the Rokers/Fairlands site is a significantly more sustainable location for the new secondary school than Normandy/Flexford.

The results of the analysis show that a substantial portion of the catchment for the new school would be from northern Guildford. In those circumstances, the proximity of Wanborough Station to the Normandy/Flexford site would be of little or no benefit in that pupils would need to travel into central Guildford to get the train back out. Equally, for those pupils travelling on the KITE service, it would make no sense for them to have to travel past the Rokers site on the A323 for several miles to get to the Normandy/Flexford school site.

The Infrastructure Schedule contained at Appendix C should be amended, therefore, to include provision of a new five form entry secondary school on the Rokers site as part of a new mixed use development to include housing, community uses and sporting facilities.
Transport Planning & Infrastructure Ltd has been instructed by Crimson Project Management Ltd to prepare Transport Representations in respect of the Guildford Borough Council Proposed Submission Local Plan.

These transport representation focus on the exclusion of the Rokers site at Fairlands Farm, Holly Lane from the Draft Local Plan and seek to justify its The site is currently subject to an outline planning application (reference 16/P/01397) for the construction of up to 370 residential dwellings and a new school/educational facility.

In addition, these representations seek to provide a comparison of the Rokers site against the Normandy/Flexford allocated site A46, demonstrating how the Rokers site benefits from being located in a more sustainable location than Normandy/Flexford.

Location

This site is located to the south of Normandy, linking the villages of Flexford and It is located within a parcel of land, broadly bound by the A323 Guildford Road to the north, the Guildford - Ash railway line to the south, Westwood Lane to the west and Glaziers Lane to the east. It should be noted that the allocated site does not comprise all of this area, though these broad boundaries constrain the site location. The portion of land is reduced due to residential properties being located along Glaziers Lane, which are outside of the site ownership boundary.

Local Highway Network

The following paragraphs provide a description of the key local roads in the vicinity of the site.

A323 Guildford Road

• The A323 is part of the distributor road network, linking Guildford to the east with Ash and Aldershot to the The A323 is a single carriageway road along its length, with a 30 miles per hour speed limit along the length of the A323 through Normandy. The speed varies between 30 mph and 40 mph to the west of the site, and includes a section of SOmph carriageway to the east of Normandy.

• The A323 is subject to high traffic flows, especially in the peak The route represents a key route into Guildford, avoiding the A3 or A31.

Pedestrian footways are located along the southern side of the A323 carriageway through Normandy in the vicinity of the site.

Westwood Lane

• Westwood Lane is a 'C' class route (C16) providing a link on a predominantly north south axis between Normandy and the A31 to the south, in

• Westwood Lane is subject to a 30 mile per hour speed limit through Flexford, with sections subject to a 40 mph speed limit to the north and south of

• The route is subject to a width and height restriction by way of a bridge under the railway line, which restricts vehicles below 14 feet and 3 inches This bridge is also restricted to a single lane of traffic, with priority given to southbound traffic movements.

• Pedestrian footways are provided on both sides of the carriageway through Flexford, with only one footway provided between Flexford and Normandy, along the eastern side of the carriageway .

Glaziers Lane

• Glaziers Lane is subject to a 30 mile per hour speed limit, and routes from the A323 in Normandy to Westwood Lane in Flexford, via Wanborough railway This road is unclassified (060), and is lightly trafficked.
Along the northern section of Glaziers Lane, between the A323 and Normandy Village Hall, footways are provided along both sides of the carriageway. To the south, footways are provided on one side of the carriageway, with the footpath altering each side of the carriageway on numerous occasions.

**Proximity to Bus Services**

- The A323 Guildford Road is a bus corridor for the frequent KITE service, linking Guildford and Aldershot at 15 minute intervals in each
- This service would be accessible to the northern portion of the Flexford/Normandy site, with bus stops located in the vicinity of the Guildford Road/Westwood Lane/School Lane crossroads junction and in the vicinity of the Guildford Road/Glaziers Lane/Hunts Hill Road crossroad. Figure 1 provides an indication of the extent of the site that can access these bus stops based on a 400 metre walk distance using the existing road and footpath network. This Figure indicates that only a minimal portion of the site is accessible by bus.
- Additional bus services route along Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane, with the PT5 bus providing a link to St Peters School in the morning and an additional school service, the 694, operates towards Broadwater School.
- The 520 bus service is a variation of the KITE bus service, which includes a loop along Westwood Lane and Glaziers. The timetable for this service is included in Appendix A. There are just two services operating daily towards Guildford and Woking (Woking service operates on Wednesday only), and four services operating (reduces to three on Wednesdays) towards Aldershot.

**Proximity to Rail Services**

- The site is located immediately north of the Guildford - Ash railway line, with Wanborough railway station located in the southeastern corner of the A summary of services available from this station is provided in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Destinations Served</th>
<th>I AM Peak</th>
<th>I PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Half Hourly</td>
<td>Half Hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhill</td>
<td>Guildford - Shalford (Surrey) - Chilworth - Gomshall - Dorking West - Dorking Deepdene - Betchworth - Reigate - Redhill</td>
<td>No Direct Service</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascot (Berks)</td>
<td>Ash - Aldershot - Ash Vale - Frimley - Camberley - Bagshot - Ascot (Berks)</td>
<td>Half Hourly</td>
<td>Half Hourly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Ash - North Camp - Farnborough North - Blackwater - Sandhurst (Berks) - Crowthorne - Wokingham - Reading</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>No Direct Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 indicates that Wanborough station is served by three rail services routing westbound in the weekday morning peak hour and two services routing In the weekday evening peak hour, three services route eastbound and two services route westbound.

- Summary
To summarise the accessibility of the site, Figure 2 provides a public transport travel time plan from the site, highlighting areas that are accessible within 15, 30 and 60 minutes' public transport travel time. This Figure is produced based on public transport options available between 07:00 and 09:00 on a weekday. This Figure indicates that Guildford town centre, in the vicinity of the bus and train stations, is accessible within a 30 minutes' travel time from the site. However, the majority of locations surrounding Guildford are located within 60 minutes' travel.

ROKERS SITE

- The Rokers site has been excluded from the Proposed Submission Local Plan, but is subject to a live planning application (reference 16/P/01397). This application seeks outline planning permission for:
  - Up to 370 residential dwellings;
  - A new school/education facility (proposed at this stage to be a secondary school);
  - A new community hub with children's nursery, community offices, children's play centre and commercial units;
  - Highway improvements to the A323;
  - Landscaped open space; and
  - A provision of SANGS

With this application being a live planning application, it would be considered that if this application is approved, a school at the Normandy/Flexford site would not be required.

The Rokers site was put forward for inclusion within the Local Plan, but has not been suggested as a draft allocation by the Council. In terms of location and accessibility, it is considered that the Rokers site represents a more sustainable location for a school and residential development than others suggested in the plan.

Location

The Rokers site is located on the eastern side of the A323 Aldershot Road, to the east of Fairlands Village. The site is bound to the north-west by Holly Lane, a link between the A323 Aldershot Road and the A322 Worplesdon Road, and to the west by the A323 Aldershot Road.

- Merrist Wood College is located to the north-west of the site, across Holly The Rokers site therefore provides the potential for an educational hub to be created in the area, with a bus interchange facility provided within the application site to enable bus services to serve both educational sites.

Local Highway Network

- A description of the key vehicle routes in the vicinity of the application site is provided in the following paragraphs. Where relevant, reference is made to a number of automatic traffic counters (ATC) that have been placed on the carriageway in order to record traffic volumes by Each ATC recorded data for a 7-day period between 1't and 7'th March 2016.

A323 Aldershot Road

- The A323 Aldershot Road routes on a north-west to south-east axis along the site At the roundabout junction with Holly Lane, the A323 routes west towards Aldershot. The A323 is an important transport corridor as a county distributor road providing access between Guildford and Aldershot and to the A331 in the vicinity of Ash.

Along the site frontage, the A323 Aldershot Road is subject to a 40 miles per hour speed limit with a pedestrian footway provided along the eastern side of the Through the residential areas within the Guildford boundary, Aldershot Road is subject to a 30 mph speed limit and has footways along both sides of the carriageway.
An ATC placed along the A323 between the Holly Lane roundabout junction and Fairlands access junction recorded a two-way average annual daily traffic flow (AADT) of 13,109. This was split 52% westbound/48% eastbound.

**Holly Lane**

- Holly Lane routes on a north-east to south-west axis to the north-west of the Holly Lane is subject to a 40 miles per hour speed limit and has a shared foot and cycleway along the southern side of the carriageway. This shared foot/cycleway extends along the existing Rakers access road onto Aldershot Road.

An ATC placed along Holly Lane between the existing Rakers access and the Worplesdon Road roundabout junction recorded AADT traffic flows of 10,325 vehicles. This traffic is evenly distributed, 50%/50% between north east and south west bound vehicle movements.

**Accessibility to Existing Infrastructure**

**Proximity to Bus Services**

The KITE service routes along the A323 in the vicinity of the site, with services provided between Guildford and Aldershot at 15 minute intervals.

- The closest bus stops to the site are located in the vicinity of the Fairlands Avenue/A323 Aldershot Road priority junction, with the bus stop for northbound services located to the north of the junction and the southbound bus stop located to the south of this.

- Figure 3 provides a 400 metre walking isochrone to indicate areas that are located within 400 metres walk of these bus stops. Figure 3 indicates that the majority of the site is accessible within 400 metres walk, based on the existing infrastructure and walking routes, with only the corners of the site located outside of this walk distance.

In comparison, only a small portion of the Normandy/Flexford site is located within walking distance of a bus stop servicing the frequent KITE service, indicating that the Rakers site is more accessible by bus services based on existing infrastructure. This is beneficial as it negates the need for any re-routing of existing bus services or any new bus services to be created, instead increasing the patronage on the profitable KITE service.

In addition, the 17 service provides additional services between Fairlands and Guildford, though less frequent than the KITE service.

**Proximity to Rail Services**

- Whilst the nearest railway station to the site is Worplesdon station, the easiest station to access from the site is Guildford railway. The KITE service can be used to access Guildford town centre, with no public transport links available to Worplesdon station.

- Worplesdon station is located on the mainline London Waterloo - Portsmouth railway line and is served every 20 minutes towards London Waterloo and half hourly towards Haslemere and Portsmouth in the weekday morning peak hour. During the evening peak hour, services operate every 20 minutes towards Haslemere and Portsmouth and half hourly to London Waterloo.

Guildford railway station is located on the North Downs Line, in addition to the London Waterloo mainline, providing additional services between Reading and Gatwick Airport. Table 2 below summarises the rail services accessible from Guildford station.

<see attachments for table 2>

- Table 2 indicates that Guildford station is well served by rail services, especially in comparison to Wanborough station served by the Flexford/Normandy.

Summary
To summarise the accessibility of the Rokers site, Figure 4 provides public transport travel time isochrones detailing areas that are accessible within 15, 30 and 60 minutes' travel time from the site. It should be noted that Guildford town centre is accessible within a 30-minute travel time from the site, with Woking also accessible within this timeframe.

**RESIDENTIAL AND SCHOOL COMPARISON**

Whilst the above sections detail information on the location and accessibility of the two potential sites, this section will provide more of a direct comparison in respect of access by public transport for the residential and school aspects of each site.

**Residential Accessibility**

- For the residential development, accessibility to the local towns is vital, as these are the areas where the majority of residents will work and head for shopping and leisure trips.

- Figures 2 and 4 provide travel time isochrones from each site and enable the allocated Flexford/Normandy site and the proposed Rokers site to be directly compared.

- Figure 2 indicates that the Flexford/Normandy site enables Ash, Wanborough station and Fairlands to be accessed within 15 minutes' travel time from the site. In comparison, Figure 4 indicates that Guildford bus station is accessible within 15 minutes' travel from the Rokers site, along with Ash railway station, and sections along the A323 and A322 Worplesdon Road.

- In terms of accessibility to local towns, Figure 4 indicates that the Rakers site can access much of Guildford town centre within 30 minutes' travel time, along with Ash and a section of Aldershot. In addition, areas of Mayford are also accessible within a 30 minutes' travel time from the site. Woking is accessible within 60 minutes' travel time alongside Godalming, Clandon, Farnham, Farnborough and areas to the south of Guildford.

In contrast, Figure 2 indicates that the Flexford/Normandy site can access Ash within 15 minutes, and sections of Aldershot and Guildford within 30 minutes' travel time. Within 60 minutes' travel, Woking, Farnborough, Godalming and areas to the south and east of Guildford are accessible.

- To compare the two locations, the areas accessible within a 60-minute travel time are broadly similar, as expected from the relatively short distance between the sites along the A322. The key difference between the sites is the proximity to Guildford town centre, with Rakers accessible to the majority of the town centre within 30 minutes and the bus station within 15 minutes. This indicates that the Rakers site is more sustainably located to residents commuting to work by sustainable modes, with more key locations located within a shorter commuting distance.

**School Accessibility**

- To assess the accessibility of the school, assumptions need to be made regarding the likely school catchment. This information is not publicly accessible, and therefore assumptions have been based on existing school catchment areas and the stated need for a school to the north and west of Guildford.

- As the Rakers site has already been submitted as a planning application, this comparative assessment will make use of the assumptions undertaken within the Transport Assessment for this development. This utilised a gravity model approach to assess the likely school catchment.

- It is assumed that demand for school places would be mostly driven from northern Guildford and surrounding rural area locations towards Ash and Aldershot and north to Mayford and Given the difference in residential population between Ash and Guildford, the majority of students are expected to come from the north Guildford area.

- By assessing the locations of the nearest secondary schools to the site and their indicative catchment based on school acceptance criteria for distance from the school, it can be seen that Ash is served by Ash Manor The...
north west area of Guildford is served only by small school catchments in Bellfields (Christ's College) and Park Barn (King's College). On this basis, a 65% to 10% split will be assessed between Guildford and Ash for the purposes of this gravity model, with the remaining trips from the outlying areas between Ash and Guildford.

• Census data relating to the number of children per ward has been investigated to provide a more detailed gravity model, with Figure 6.6 of the Transport Assessment included at Appendix B providing the gravity model plan used within this. This indicates that the north Guildford area, and in particular the wards of Westborough, Stoughton and Stoke would represent the key catchment area for the school.

• Figures 2 and 4 provide an indication of the likely travel times from each site in the weekday morning peak hour and these provide an indication of the accessibility of the school catchment area to each.

Figure 2 indicates that Westborough ward and a portion of the Stoughton ward are accessible within 30 minutes' travel time from the Flexford/Normandy site, whilst the whole catchment is accessible within a 60 minutes' travel time. Figure 4 indicates that the Rakers site can access portions of the Westborough and Stoughton wards in 15 minutes, with the entirety of these wards and a portion of the Stoke ward accessible within 30 minutes' travel time to the Rakers site. Again, as with the Flexford/Normandy site, the full catchment is located within a 60 minutes' travel time of the site.

• In terms of accessibility towards Ash and the outlying areas, there is little difference between the two sites, with a large part of the outlying areas accessible within 15 minutes' travel Ash railway station is accessible within 15 minutes' travel time with the remainder of Ash accessible within 30 minutes of the Rokers site. In comparison, the Flexford/Normandy site provides access to a larger area of Ash within a 30 minutes' travel time, with areas along the route to Aldershot more accessible.

• It can be seen that the Rokers site represents a more sustainable location for the school based on its proximity to the residential areas.

Summary

• In summary, it is considered that the Rokers site is clearly better in terms of accessibility and location to the Flexford/Normandy allocated. This is due to key areas including the potential school catchment area and workplace areas within Guildford being more accessible from the site, with larger areas accessible within a 15 and 30-minute travel time from the site.

• SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

  ° Transport Planning & Infrastructure Ltd has been instructed by Crimson Project Management Ltd to prepare these Transport Representations against the Guildford Borough Council Proposed Submission Local Plan.

  ° These representations provide a comparison between the Flexford/Normandy allocated site and the Rokers. The Flexford/Normandy site is included as allocation A46, with the Rokers site excluded from the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

  ° The Rokers site is subject to a live planning application for an educational facility and residential development on land to the east of Fairlands.

  ° In summary, these representations have identified that the Rokers site is ideally located to key infrastructure, with the majority of the site located within a 400 metre walk distance to the frequent KITE bus. In contrast, the Flexford/Normandy site is poorly located to existing public transport infrastructure, despite the location of Wanborough station in the south eastern corner of the site.

  ° In terms of accessibility, the Rokers site is more conveniently located in terms of travel times to local towns and the potential school catchment area, with more key areas accessible within 15 and 30 minutes' travel time compared to the Flexford/Normandy.

On this basis, it is considered that the Rokers site provides a significantly more sustainable location for an educational facility and residential development than the draft allocations.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  

Comment ID: pslp171/2535  
Respondent: 11199841 / Woodstreet Village Association (Neville Byran) 
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We do not believe the maths support developer funding the infrastructure and the affordable housing requirements via any method, including CIL. Indeed it is doubtful they would they would add up to a significant part of either infrastructure OR affordable housing costs required. On this point alone the proposed plan fails.

We note that since the previous plan, Guildford has been identified as the 4th most congested town in England.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5884  
Respondent: 11992097 / Karen Fryatt 
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Lack of specific details regarding the essential infrastructure needed including roads, junctions, sewage, amenities. Many of these need to be decided and started before a site such as Gosden Hill can be marked for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16718  
Respondent: 11992097 / Karen Fryatt 
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Lack of specific details regarding the essential infrastructure needed including roads, junctions, sewage, amenities. Many of these need to be decided and started before a site such as Gosden Hill can be marked for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16662  
Respondent: 12050145 / richard gunston 
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Lack of specific details regarding the essential infrastructure needed including roads, junctions, sewage, amenities. Many of these need to be decided and started before a site such as Gosden Hill can be marked for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill in particular cannot be built until the roads and waste is sorted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/147  Respondent: 13707041 / Kirsty Lockie  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I'm afraid I do not have time to trawl through the multitude of documents that have been produced but I wanted to comment on the planned development in Flexford/Normandy. Whilst I appreciate the need for more housing in Surrey, the scale of this development will not work. The infrastructure (in particular roads and drainage) will not be able to handle that many more homes. The idea that a new school is needed in the area is questionable at best and feels like a way of justifying the scale of the development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10919  Respondent: 13713825 / Barry Williams  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We need road and public transport improvements, a proper bus and train interchange and key infrastructure works carried out along sections of the A3 to help remove traffic from the town centre.

For these reasons, I support the aspirations of the Local Plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2700  Respondent: 14177217 / Michael Forster  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We wish to respond with our comments to the Draft Local Plan as follows:
Generally we support the views of the Guildford Residents Association.

We oppose Guildford expanding by a quarter without full and proper consideration being given to increases and drastic improvements to the infrastructure that is required and a full commitment to implement them ahead of any new development taking place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2485  Respondent: 14181313 / Vision for Guildford Ltd - GVG (William Stokoe)  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The single, most significant omission regarding the town centre and its infrastructure is a cohesive plan to redirect traffic away from the centre via a new East/West link as proposed by GVG. This was mentioned in our previous Local Plan 2014 submission. A sketch of the link is reproduced here with the new rail/river bridge arrowed:

[see attached file 'GVG bridge route.jpeg']

Such a link would instantly enable wider pedestrianisation of the town centre – specifically Bridge and Onslow Streets – bringing a safer, less polluted environment. The bridge would also enable the reinvigoration of the riverside on both sides, below the bottom of North and High Streets, and the demolition of the ugly four lane concrete Friary Bridge that blights the character of our historic gap town at its very centre.

There is no attempt in the Local Plan to safeguard any potential route for such a new East/West link.

There has been no new town centre East/West link across the railway and river since the building of the Farnham Road Bridge in the 1840s. The Farnham Road bridge capacity is constrained, is rapidly approaching the end of its safe life and is too low for modern rail freight traffic (as set out in the rail ‘Wessex Plan”).

The level and importance of development to the West of the town since 1840 should surely suggest a need for another link. The town centre and Guildford’s health and economy is at a disadvantage from inadequate and imperfect links to key sites such as the Royal Surrey Hospital, Surrey University, the Research Park with its world class and world leading facilities and activities. If large housing development is to be accommodated to the West of the town then there should be adequate provision for the inevitable increase in consequent vehicular traffic from such development, irrespective of the impact of modal shift and sustainable movement policies. Guildford is a gap town, with topographic constraints on solutions such as a ring road. The beauty of its setting also provides constraints.

Within a wider pedestrianisation in the town centre there should be provision for better pedestrian routes to the Cathedral and University. The Local Plan makes no attempt to achieve that, to the detriment of the town and its sense of community.

GVG is pro—growth and supports good, well designed development. Guildford Town Centre is about to undergo a sustained period of significant development, including creation of an additional 48,000sq m of retail and related space, principally via the redevelopment of North Street. It is hard, if not impossible, to discern from the Local Plan how such considerable development will be served by appropriate infrastructure. It is not clear what public benefits will accrue in the shape of new public space and better public realm. There is no sense of an overarching plan or design ethos that will support and enhance the historic core of the town that makes it so attractive to its residents and to a wide range of visitors.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Taking this into account with Cil projected @ £500 per meter how are you going to get any housing built!!! Every other borough is £125. I would recommend you review this or you will never get any houses built.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I'd like to have it on record that I, Christopher James Heath, a resident of Send Village in Surrey, strongly object to the proposed plan in the revised local plan from guildford Borough Council of 400 homes and a factory of 7000 sq m for industrial purpose.

My reasons.

1) Infrastructure

I have spoken to Matt Furness about what or not there are any plans in place to increase the existing infrastructure of effected areas and have been told that there is not. When I say infrastructure I mean everything from transport (both the roads and the public options like busses and trains) to the already collapsing victorian sewers, to the medical facilities and schools. The phone net works, broadband, mobile masts, electoral supplies, road widening, shops, pubs etc..

It seems that thousands of buildings across this borough are going to be 'thrown up' with out any consideration for infrastructure. Surly this needs to be addressed before any plans can even start to be consulted on? I would have thought that the first logical step!?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I have spoken to Matt Furness about whether or not there are any plans in place to increase the existing infrastructure of effected areas and have been told that there is not. When I say infrastructure. I mean everything from transport (both the
roads and the public options like busses and trains) to the already collapsing Victorian sewers, to the medical facilities and schools. The phone net works, broadband, mobile masts, electoral supplies, road widening, shops, pubs etc.. It seems that thousands of buildings across this borough are going to be 'thrown up' with out any consideration for infrastructure. Surely this needs to be addressed before any plans can even start to be consulted on? I would have thought that the first logical step?!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8345  **Respondent:** 15062145 / Philippa Hackett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to register my objections to the New Local Plan.

The Plan does not seem to have a clear design for the whole area. It if does it certainly is not making it clear. Firstly the Transport Plan has been produced very late in the day (only released on the day of publication) and without this infrastructure, none of the developments should take place. It seems that Guildford Borough Council is planning a series of large developments along the A3 corridor but has not thoroughly looked at the impact of this for the surrounding villages. The villages on both sides of the A3 have very inadequate roads to cope with the anticipated amount of traffic and the roads available cannot be improved to the point that will ease the expected congestion. There are many other worries as well, such as environmental concerns, noise pollution, air pollution, flood risks, the sheer quantity of housing and industrial units supposedly required, the list goes on.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6299  **Respondent:** 15062625 / Stephen Groves  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered at any point in this proposed Local Plan, and are inadequate to deal with proposed increase in housing levels. Roads, public transport, availability at doctor’s surgery and places within schools will be unable to cope with the increase in housing and population.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4184  **Respondent:** 15076513 / Ian Groden  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered at any point in this proposed Local Plan, and are inadequate to deal with proposed increase in housing levels. Roads, public transport, availability at doctor’s surgery and places within schools will be unable to cope with the increase in housing and population.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With reference to my e-mails of 7 June and 16 June below, I wish to record further objections based on additional aspects which have come to my attention:

I object to the fact that, I understand, sites in or adjacent to Send could deliver almost half the number of houses planned to be delivered for the next 15 years in the GBC Spatial Strategy. If true, this is a totally unfair and disproportionate burden to be imposed on the residents of this modest village, involving heavy increases in traffic on the Burnt Common Roundabout and Send Road, which would only be further increased if the new slip roads are created in connection with the Garlick’s Arch development application. Why cannot a system of fair burden-sharing of new development be applied to the existing settlements across the Borough, in proportion to size? Particularly as the developments will lead to vastly increased car use, congestion, overstretched social infrastructure and more greenhouse gas emission, noise and light pollution to affect this community so badly?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4785  Respondent: 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

32   POLICY I1 INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY

32.1   I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery

32.2   Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

32.3   The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

32.4   The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

32.5   Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.
32.6 This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

32.7 The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints.

32.8 The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model.

32.9 Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods.

32.10 Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan.

32.11 The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network.

32.12 It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below.

32.13 In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5..indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’.

32.14 The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”.

32.15 Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided.

32.16 The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR:
32.16.1 Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road /Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3)

32.16.2 Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/ B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8).

32.16.3 Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14)

32.16.4 Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction.

32.16.5 Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction).

32.16.6 Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane.

32.16.7 Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

32.17 The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen.

32.18 The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/709  Respondent: 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1 I object to the new Guildford Borough Council Transport Strategy 2017.

1.2 I object to ASP 3 new A3/A3100/B2215/A247 Burpham-Burnt common all-movements junction, formed by a new connector road linking between new A3/A3100 Burpham junction (SRN4) and the B2215 London Road, in combination with the new A3 northbound on-slip (SRN9) and the new A3 southbound off-slip (SRN10) under Infrastructure and Delivery.
1.3 If development gets the go ahead for the strategic site at Gosden Hill it would be logical to construct a 4 way A3 interchange at Burpham. It is not feasible to pass the problem down the line to Send which will already be bearing the brunt of traffic generated from a planned 4,000 homes. The A247 link road to Woking already at capacity will become gridlocked.

1.4 I object to SRN4 New A3/A3100 Burpham junction with relocated A3 southbound off-slip and new A3 southbound on-slip. This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 whereby traffic will be passing directly through Send from the A3 and M25 and the proposed new development at Wisley.

1.5 I object to SRN9 A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common) and SRN10 A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common). This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 which is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3575  **Respondent:** 15086017 / Shuli Sinai  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/50  **Respondent:** 15099265 / Andrew Crawford  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **Congestion on the trunk roads, A3/M25**
   
   I object to the development of the strategic sites due to A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. In the morning it regularly already takes 40 minutes or more to travel the three miles from my home to join the M25. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020 and even then it is doubtful if those plans will be sufficient. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.

2. **Congestion on the local village roads and lanes**

   Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. Send Marsh Road is already a rat run with constant traffic using it as a cut through. I object to further development which will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.

3. **Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic**

   Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
4. **Lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites**
   I object to the lack of planning and implementation of infrastructure. For example at Garlick’s Arch. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ quality of life will significantly deteriorate in many ways. We already struggle to get doctors appointments and the local schools are already struggling.

5. **Lack of Utilities Capacity**
   Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. I object to the development of Garlick’s Arch on the ground that there is little capacity in these networks.

6. **Sites being planned in unsustainable locations**
   Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

7. **Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population**
   Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. To which I object.

8. **Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed**
   Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object due to the further stress it will put upon existing health services.

9. **Local policing facilities will be overwhelmed**
   Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the likes of Garlick’s Arch and Wisley Airfield will stretch the police services further and I object.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/54  **Respondent:** 15099649 / David Powell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )**, **is Sound? ( )**, **is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Unambitious proposals:

1) No provision for international airport to supplement Heathrow and Gatwick;

2) No rapid rail link to airports and city centres;

3) Increase lanes on M25 and A3 to six in each direction;

4) Provision of nuclear power station for recharging of battery powered vehicles;

5) Build a city in the sky: skyscraper homes.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/120  **Respondent:** 15106689 / Joseph Hine  **Agent:**

---
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object the development of the strategic sites at Wisley Airfield, Garlicks arch and Gosden Hill as the road infrastructure does not have capacity to cope with large developments of the proposed scale. As a daily commuter i see that the A3/M25 junction is congested by 07:00 hours daily and in the evenings the entire M25 is congested between J16 and J10. Both the M25 and the A3 would need significant increase in capacity prior to the inclusion of the proposed strategic sites in any local plan.

2. I object to the inclusion of the Wisley airfield site and Garlicks Arch as strategic sites due to the congestion on local roads at all times of day. For instance it is often hard to pull out of my home onto the main road in Ripley due to a continual flow of traffic, adding more residents to the local area will result in a large increase in the number of accidents, especially as the roads are narrow.

3. I object to the Strategic sites as the road network that currently exists is barley maintained by the council, an increase in the traffic and number of HGVs using the roads will result in further deterioration. Many roads have large potholes on their perimeters meaning it is dangerous for two vehicles to pass in some places. Additionally there are limited cycle lanes and footpaths making it dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists on the roadways in the area.

4. I object to the inclusion of Wisley airfield and Garlicks Arch in the local plan due to them being in unsustainable locations regarding public transport. Neither location has a suitable train station located within realistic walking or cycling distance, this means only bus services and cars are feasible. Due to the large size of the sites its unrealistic to assume everyone will use the bus as it will not have capacity for the 200 homes at peak times unless 50 buses are to arrive in convoys to transport commuters. TO make these sites sustainable you must build a station and a branch line, or an overground tram similar to those used in Wimbledon at the developers cost, this would then also benefit existing local communities.

5. I object to the lack of immediate provision for any new schools. My wife is currently expecting our first child and with a proposed extra 6,500 houses to be built between the M25 and Burpham, our local primary schools will be placed under even more pressure for places. Our children will potentially have to travel long distances to go to school which will affect their quality of life and add more traffic to our already congested roads.
I object to further development as it will cause further congestion on our roads in and around our villages. The A3 and M25 are already at saturation point when I try and get to work during rush hour, our villages have long queues through them and parking spaces are virtually non-existent in Send and Ripley. Extra homes in the area will put further pressure on our roads and cause even more pollution in our area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The access road to Send Hill from Potters Lane is a narrow single track road and not suitable for 40 houses and 2 travellers sites. This junction is treacherous with no clear vision if you are coming from Send Hill into Potters Lane. With speeding motorists using Potters Lane as a cut through to and from the A3, any additional traffic will make this junction even more hazardous. Myself and my daughter narrowly missed being involved in an accident today on the bend heading from Potters Lane to the Send Hill turning – a large lorry and a Fiat 500 had been involved in an incident where the Fiat had been damaged by the lorry where the road is very narrow. The previous week I was nearly involved in a head on collision on the same bend with a lorry in the middle of the road as the lorry was too large for the narrow lane, resulting in the lorry leaving tyre skid marks which can be seen on the road. My daughter’s car has been damaged by a passing car coming from Send Hill, where her wing mirror was broken, and I have had the same experience, these are not isolated incidents as Send Hill and Potters lane are too narrow for the traffic using them. The proposed development would not be in keeping with the beautiful and peaceful surroundings of the area including the cemetery and the adjoining properties in Send Hill. I understand that the Send Hill Development was not part of any previous consultations and I am concerned about the impact of this level of development on residents and cemetery users.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I also object to the plans for the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley, land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. The infrastructure of Send Village is not able to cope with the existing daily traffic as it is, especially at peak times with commuters and school runs. Most days there is congestion along Send Road. My daughter worked in Ripley for six years and it regularly took her 50 minutes to travel from her house in Westfield to work during peak travel times. This was one of the reasons she chose to move jobs. There are no realistic alternative routes for motorists to take from Send Road and many cars chose to cut through Potters Lane to avoid sitting in traffic, many of which are large lorries who are too big for the road or speeding commuters in cars, which pose daily danger to the residents of Potters Lane, any increase in traffic will only add to the danger.

I would be grateful if you could pass my comments onto the Planning Inspector and confirm safe receipt of this email. I do hope you will take on board my feedback and the feedback of the residents of Send who very much care about the village and its surroundings and who have lived in the village for many years.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/161  Respondent: 15106977 / Y C Smithers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The access road to Send Hill from Potters Lane is a narrow single track road and not suitable for 40 houses and 2 travellers sites. This junction is treacherous with no clear vision if you are coming from Send Hill into Potters Lane. With speeding motorists using Potters Lane as a cut through to and from the A3, any additional traffic will make this junction even more hazardous. My mum and I narrowly missed being involved in an accident today on the bend heading from Potters Lane to the Send Hill turning – a large lorry and a Fiat 500 had been involved in an incident where the Fiat had been damaged by the lorry where the road is very narrow. The previous week my mum was nearly involved in a head on collision on the same bend with a lorry in the middle of the road as the lorry was too large for the narrow lane. My car has been damaged previously having the wing mirror broken by a passing car coming from Send Hill and these are not isolated incidents, they happen regularly because Send Hill and Potters Lane aren’t wide enough for the level of traffic using them. The proposed development would not be in keeping with the beautiful and peaceful surroundings of the area including the cemetery and the adjoining properties in Send Hill. I understand that the Send Hill Development was not part of any previous consultations and I am concerned about the impact of this level of development on local residents and cemetery users.

I object to the plans for the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley, land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. The infrastructure of Send Village is not able to cope with the existing daily traffic as it is, especially at peak times with commuters and school runs. Most days there is congestion along Send Road. In the six years I worked in Ripley, it regularly took me 50 minutes to travel from my house in Westfield to work during peak travel times. This was one of the reasons I chose to move jobs. There are no realistic alternative routes for motorists to take from Send Road and many cars chose to cut through Potters Lane to avoid sitting in traffic, many of which are large lorries who are too big for the road or speeding commuters in cars, posing daily danger to the residents of Potters Lane, any increase in traffic will only add to the danger.

I would be grateful if you could pass my comments onto the Planning Inspector and confirm safe receipt of this email. I do hope you will take on board my feedback and the feedback of the residents of Send who very much care about the village and its surroundings and who have lived in the village for many years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8948  Respondent: 15107297 / Ian McQuattie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY)

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
• Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
• Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
• No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/138  Respondent: 15107777 / Paul Ayers  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have lived in this village for over 40 years, understand the limitations of the infrastructure and the high cost of putting them right, and strongly object to any further housing development and urbanisation which have no evidence to back up their necessity.

The programme is being driven by remote central interests and ambitions and take no account of any objective approach to planning which should rightfully include consideration of and concentration on existing urban areas and brownfield sites, not open countryside and villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/141  Respondent: 15107937 / Ken Harding  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to the disproportionate amount of development in several areas of the Borough, including the Garlick's Arch site at Burnt Common which will add to the already heavy traffic using the local roads and local services.

Finally may I point out that Ripley already has a look of a giant car park during the day, with the High Street looking like a "drive through zone" due to the already huge amount of traffic using the village to get to the A3/M25, and back.

To build the amount of housing included in the Local Plan will be a complete step in the wrong direction for the local community and environmentally a disaster.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/151</th>
<th>Respondent: 15108801 / David Allison</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other serious issue is the infrastructure associated with the above proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived in Ripley/Send for 14 years and have been affected by the enormous increase in traffic flow on the A3 and the increase in traffic flow through Ripley Village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle divert to try and avoid the traffic build up going from Guildford to the M25 junction 10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the above proposals there will be many more occasions of &quot;Log Jams&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/152</th>
<th>Respondent: 15108801 / David Allison</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing there is a population explosion in the South East why do not local authorities encourage more housing developments to areas more suitable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly with very considerable increase in &quot;Concrete&quot; developments there are very real environmental concerns and diminishing quality of life resulting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the increase in aging population in the South East there will be a lack of doctors surgeries/hospital places and for the very young school places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surely you cannot build housing developments without ensuring first the provisions adequate roads, doctors surgeries, hospitals and schools are in place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would also seem that the sudden announcement of these developments gives very short notice to local population. Why??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be a tragedy if these proposals destroy our villages in this way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASE DON'T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/155</th>
<th>Respondent: 15108833 / Barry Armstrong</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None of these villages has the roads to sustain the construction traffic during the building of these small towns, let alone the increase in traffic once complete. There is also a distinct lack of detail surrounding the provision of schools, doctors and other services required to support the increase in population to these areas.

Please do not pass this Local Plan as it put an even bigger burden on the already overstretched local services in these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. Congestion on the trunk roads, A3/M25
   I object to the development of the strategic sites due to A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. In the morning it regularly already takes 40 minutes or more to travel the three miles from my home to join the M25. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020 and even then it is doubtful if those plans will be sufficient. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.

2. Congestion on the local village roads and lanes
   Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. Send Marsh Road is already a rat run with constant traffic using it as a cut through. I object to further development which will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.

3. Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic
   Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

4. Lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites
   I object to the lack of planning and implementation of infrastructure. For example at Garlick’s Arch. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ quality of life will significantly deteriorate in many ways. We already struggle to get doctors appointments and the local schools are already struggling.

5. Lack of Utilities Capacity
   Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. I object to the development of Garlick’s Arch on the ground that there is little capacity in these networks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. **Sites being planned in unsustainable locations**
   Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

2. **Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population**
   Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. To which I object.

3. **Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed**
   Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object due to the further stress it will put upon existing health services.

4. **Local policing facilities will be overwhelmed**
   Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the likes of Garlick’s Arch and Wisley Airfield will stretch the police services further and I object.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2816  **Respondent:** 15109537 / Elizabeth Alexander  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/184  **Respondent:** 15111873 / Cindy Knight  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4) I object to the fact that these sites will give more congestion to the M25 and A3. There is already traffic congestion most days of the week trying to get passed Guildford.

5) I object to the fact that these developments will cause more parking problems – it is virtually impossible to park in Ripley as it is.

6) I object to the fact that residents in the new developments would be reliant on motor cars etc. as there are no railway stations near and the bus service is being reduced all the time.

Please give the above your urgent consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/186  Respondent: 15111905 / Wendy Reed  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that these sites will give more congestion to the M25 and A3. There is already traffic congestion most days of the week trying to get passed Guildford.

I object to the fact that these developments will cause more parking problems – it is virtually impossible to park in Ripley as it is.

I object to the fact that residents in the new developments would be reliant on motor cars etc. as there are no railway stations near and the bus service is being reduced all the time.

Please give the above your urgent consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/193  Respondent: 15112193 / Jennifer Reigate  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Garlicks Arch on the Ripley and Send border and Gosden Hill Clandon. This will have an impact on the services to these areas such as Health and Education. The Villages Medical Centre is already stretched and there is a wait for appointments and the local schools will be oversubscribed resulting in local people not being offered a place for their children, this putting a strain on transport.

The added developments will mean an increase in traffic which is already severely contested in peak times. Rose Lane and Newark Lane being worst hit.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/195  Respondent: 15112257 / Richard Winzor  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my objection to the above plans on the following grounds:

1) The communications in the local area are totally inadequate for such large-scale developments. As there is no rail link nearby, this will inevitably mean that local roads will bear the brunt of the large extra influx of residents/workers. The local roads cannot cope currently with the flow of vehicles at rush hours and school runs and the A3 is often near saturation point in the proximity of the M25 Interchange. The situation is bound to become considerably worse with the proposed plans.

2) What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/197  Respondent: 15112257 / Richard Winzor  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4) Other facilities such such as local businesses, shops and restaurants could be strained or overwhelmed with many more vehicles chasing already non-existent parking places. Indeed the largest supermarket in the area, Budgen in Ripley village, is actually closing down this week!

In summary, the proposals will place an intolerable strain for existing residents, and those who need to use the local infrastructures, and should therefore not be permitted to go ahead.

3) What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/204  Respondent: 15112769 / Gordon Laidlaw  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the draft Local Plan with its proposed developments in Ripley, Send and Clandon.

As a resident living off the Portsmouth Road I am already blighted with traffic noise and pollution from this road. This proposed change would further exacerbate these problems. Traffic flows through these three villages are already reaching crisis point as the road systems were never planned for these volumes of traffic - especially regarding Ripley and Clandon.

To bring forward a proposal of this size without adequate discussion with local residents is extremely dictatorial and unacceptable. Local amenities such as doctors’ surgeries and schools are already stretched.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/216  Respondent:  15112769 / Gordon Laidlaw   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Apart from this, the flow of traffic through Ripley and Clandon are already causing extreme problems with large articulated lorries attempting to negotiate the narrow stretches of roads these villages offer.

I have seen many blockages there caused by these lorries unable to pass each other on the narrow bends and even causing accidents. The A3 into Guildford from Clandon already becomes severely blocked too at certain times of the day and one can imagine the extra vehicles from these houses would cause further and more frequent chaos for these poor travellers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/212  Respondent:  15113281 / Mr and Mrs Richardson   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2) Size and Location of the Proposed Development at Garlick’s Arch -

We strongly object to the development, which is large for the area, with over 400 houses proposed, which would have a massive impact on the local villages infrastructure as follows:

a) Traffic / Congestion – Send and Ripley are massively impacted by their location to the A3/M25. it is almost impossible some mornings to get out of the top of our road (we live in Chestnut Close) – trying to turn right onto Portsmouth Road is not only difficult it is also dangerous during rush hour. From 7.30 onwards during morning rush hour there is a queue of traffic from the junction of Portsmouth Road and Send Marsh Road, going down past Linden Way and all the way back past the Saddlers Arms, often as far as the green. It also queues at Mays Corner / Send Crossroads, up past Send First School to the roundabout, and going the other way towards Woking This is the situation on a normal day. If there is an accident on the A3 or the M25 or roadworks or any kind of adverse weather or other problem the situation is ten times worse! (we suggest a traffic survey team would be advised to monitor for themselves). If you build 400 houses and an industrial site, in this area, the congestion it would cause with at least 400 extra cars + on the road would be phenomenal. Further to this the detrimental impact of pollution in this area. And not to mention the impact of these extra cars speeding up and down Send Barns Lane past the school – which already is dangerous as there is no crossing. If you factor in a further 2000 homes still proposed in the local plan at Wisley (despite earlier rejection by Guildford Borough Council), along with proposals for 2200 homes at Clandon/Burpham – these proposals will create further traffic problems and congestion.

b) Infrastructure – There are not enough primary and secondary school places as it is for the residents of Send and Ripley. What proposals are in place for school paces for an extra 400 + children at least, not just for the immediate future but the next 5/10 years.? If this proposal is pushed through then schools should be built concurrent to the housing, otherwise there will be serious issues for residents. It is also virtually impossible to get to see a doctor at The Villages Medical Centre – not only can you never get through on the phone, but when you can you not get an appointment. They cannot cope with the volume of residents – much of which is an ageing population – without several hundred extra residents – and their children etc. I agree that there is a chronic shortage of housing in the Borough – especially affordable housing –
we appreciate that provision needs to be made for more housing (our children are 17 and 15 and they will never be able to afford a home in this area – that’s if there are even any available!) but you cannot just continue putting up massive housing developments without putting in the infrastructure alongside the housing, to support the residents.

We strongly object to these proposed developments and also to the lack of consideration given to the residents and their concerns, the limited consultation period and the lack of planning for the adverse effects on infrastructure these developments will have on the surrounding area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
In the second place, as I wrote when I objected to the earlier proposal in the 2014 consultation, the area simply does not have the infrastructure, services and amenities to handle such a large increase in population. It is not a case of having land available to build on (itself debateable), but how the villages themselves will actually absorb the increase in population. Roads, schools, shops, parking spaces, I could go on because the list is a long one - all are simply not available in the capacity required to handle the increase in population that would accompany such housebuilding.

The local plan proposed would be a disaster for existing AND FUTURE residents for the reasons I cite.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the fact that we purchased a house on Burnt Common Lane with views over fields and now the local plan want to remove this view and replace with 400 houses, industrial units and slip roads.

I object to the planned A3 junction changes at Burnt Common due to the negative effect on the surrounding villages which will not be able to handle the additional traffic in an already busy area.

I object to all the additional houses when the local schools are already overwhelmed with new applicants. The school in Send where my children attend is currently being rebuilt, with no further capacity to take additional children and has no desire to do so.

I object to all the additional houses as the local doctors surgery is already at its full capacity and this will put additional pressure the services impacting local services.

I object to the additional amount of cars that will be on the road in the immediate and surrounding areas, causing further risk to our children as they travel to and from school.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I object to the lack of provision to improve the current infrastructure which is currently inadequate.
2. I object to the lack of additional parking provisions in the villages – again which are currently inadequate.
3. I object to the 4 way junction to the A3 which will force more traffic through the already overloaded roads, which incidentally are in a very poor state of repair.

1. I object to the Garlick’s Arch development as it does not provide for sufficient Utilities capacity which is currently almost at capacity.
2. I object to the designated 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch as this is in addition to the 13,000 odd already proposed for the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/234  Respondent: 15114529 / Phil Vowels  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live in this part of Surrey precisely because it’s not a London over-spill (like grubby Croydon or Sutton). Reading your Local Plan, 5.3 in the Policy Approach will ensure the permanent destruction of the beauty of this area by building all over not only Ripley, but nearby West Horsley, Send and Effingham. How on earth do you imagine the infrastructure of this area will cope with thousands of new homes?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/752  Respondent: 15114721 / Leslie Macnair  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9153</th>
<th>Respondent: 15115201 / Katherine Mutton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong>, is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed infrastructure makes no mention of a larger Medical Centre - currently you have to wait 2 weeks for an appointment. Where are the schools to accommodate all these children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/253</th>
<th>Respondent: 15120129 / Anthony Merryweather</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is also the additional road traffic increase which is inevitable if you add 533 homes to an area. This in addition to the additional traffic that we are already going to have to suffer due to the Opera In the park development at West Horsley place. The building of an additional 533 will also provide a precedent for existing homes to extended in line with the sort of mini mansions I describe above. Small developments I do not object to. But I strongly object to the scale of the proposed sites and the number of homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/271</th>
<th>Respondent: 15122049 / Rebekah Day</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. **Congestion on the trunk roads, A3/M25**
   I object to the development of the strategic sites due to A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.  
2. **Congestion on the local village roads and lanes**
   Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. I object to further development which will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.  
3. **Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic**
   Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. |
4. **Poor air quality concerns**
   Further congestion, particularly in built up residential areas will only lead to greater levels of air pollution. I object to further development, which will result a fall in the air quality.

5. **Lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites**
   I object to the lack of planning and implementation of infrastructure. For example at Garlick’s Arch. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ quality of life will significantly deteriorate in many ways. How will the local services such as doctors and schools cope?

6. **Lack of Utilities Capacity**
   Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. I object to the development of Garlick’s Arch on the ground that there is little capacity in these networks.

7. **Sites being planned in unsustainable locations**
   Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

8. **Parked issues in local villages caused by larger population**
   Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. To which I object.

9. **Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed**
   Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object due to the further stress it will put upon existing health services.

10. **Local policing facilities will be overwhelmed**
    Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the likes of Garlick’s Arch and Wisley Airfield will stretch the police services further and I object.

11. **Local social welfare facilities will be overwhelmed**

12. **Local shops/restaurant facilities will be overwhelmed**

13. **No protection of heritage assets**

14. **No protection of the environment**

15. **Overdevelopment of sites**

16. **Not meeting the needs of local communities**

17. **Insufficient affordable housing**

18. **Poor quality of layout and housing design**

19. **Insufficient consideration of SPA, SSI and Conservation Area issues**

20. **Lack of proper cycle lanes on local roads**

21. **Lack of proper pedestrian footpaths on local roads**

22. **Current SHMA figure of 693 p.a. too high**

Personally, I drive down a lot of these roads everyday on my commute to work. They already suffer from huge amounts of congestion and also large vehicles using narrow lanes to the point they almost bully smaller vehicles off the road. Therefore I strongly object to this proposal.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I would like to raise an objection to the proposed quantity of new housing planned for Horsley.

I live on Ockham road North and have extreme difficulty trying to get my 2 children to different schools. There is no parking at the Raleigh school and no pavements so the children take their life in their hands dodging cars whilst they have to walk on the road.

My elder daughter went to the Howard and her bus picked her up once again on a road with no pavement so the children were standing on the dirt in a dangerous position. The space for parking at the doctors and the village is also inadequate.

Where are all these people going to go to school and Doctors etc?

There is just no structure in place for this increase in numbers.

I do not object to affordable housing in small amounts but not this many.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Primary and Secondary School and the order of build

We live a few hundred metres from The Raleigh School. When we moved here in 2011 there was not a place at The Raleigh for our daughter. There was also not place available at any Primary school in the area, which meant (fortunately for us) that The Raleigh then had to take our daughter, plus 2 other children in her year that had moved into the area at the same time. So in 2011, in my daughter’s year, every single primary school was up to full capacity and exceeding their numbers.

As is very well known, a similar issue exists with The Howard of Effingham Secondary School. The school is at full capacity. Similarly George Abbot, our nearest alternative school, is also at full capacity and consequently its catchment area never reaches Horsley.

So where do the children go to school if 533 new houses are built in East Horsley and West Horsley?

When I raised this issue with GBC officers at one of the open days I was told that the new schools at the Wisley site would provide the extra capacity. I challenged that on the basis that it seemed reasonable to assume that the Wisley Development would take some time, in particular with the infrastructure issues and not least the A3 access, and that some or all of the Horsley sites (and sites around other nearby villages) would be completed first. The officers agreed this would be the case.

So again I asked “Where do the children go to school?” I received no answer other than a shrug of the shoulders!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4521   Respondent: 15127777 / Keith Hammond   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Further future expansion

It is hard not to assume that the increase in housing proposed in West Horsley and East Horsley will then require significant additional ‘facilitating’ development to support it, resulting in yet another ‘exceptional’ need to build in the new Green Belt areas again. Obvious examples are:

Primary school: As mentioned above The Raleigh School will not be able to cope if the proposed residential development goes ahead as proposed and there isn’t room for expansion so a new school will be needed. Where?

Roads: All the roads in West Horsley are in fact lanes containing at most one pavement and therefore unsuitable for a 35% increase in housing. How will this be addressed?

Station car park: In addition to the village car park the Station car park also won’t cope. The station car park is at full capacity so certainly won’t cope with increased numbers. Where will the commuters go?

Doctor’s surgery: Is also close to, if not at, full capacity. How will this be resolved?

Where and how are these issues to be resolved?

It is hard not to come to the conclusion that we will then be into another round of ‘Exceptional’ need to expand again into the Green Belt, which is unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5929</th>
<th>Respondent: 15127809 / A W Baker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/284</th>
<th>Respondent: 15127969 / Jean Fawley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>I object to the lack of provision of any extra services or provisions that would be needed for any proposed large building development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There seems to be no provision for the extra doctors surgeries, schools or roads to take in a huge amount of extra traffic expected if these developments go ahead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/293</th>
<th>Respondent: 15128641 / Caroline Dixon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT THE LACK OF IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR NEW SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT THE LACK OF ANY IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR DOCTORS SURGERIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/299</th>
<th>Respondent: 15129377 / Frances Young</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Following your letter welcoming feedback, I am emailing with regards the proposed development at Foreman Road, Ash.

As local residents we have major concerns regarding the proposed development of “up to 115” new homes which “will include a mix of 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom detached, semi-detached and terraced houses”. Whilst we understand the requirement for new homes, particularly affordable housing, the impact this number of properties would have on our village would be enormous – even if it was half this amount and the majority of properties being smaller. Our local amenities are stretched and can’t cope as things currently stand.

To give you a real life example; I tried to get an emergency doctor’s appointment a couple of weeks ago and was unsuccessful. After negotiating with the surgery support staff I managed a call with a doctor some hours later. The Doctors response? – “we need to see you”!

This being the Friday before the bank holiday there were no appointments until the following week. Unable to wait I had to email the doctor some photos (!!!). He was great, made a diagnosis and prescribed medication. I am not in any way criticising the Health Centre, they bent over backwards to help me, they are just bursting at the seams.

Taking it one step further, I went to collect aforementioned prescription – it was a nightmare. The road to the surgery was obstructed all the way along by parked cars (Wharf Road), when I managed to get to the surgery the car park was full including surrounding roads. The road obstruction is an accident waiting to happen. I was then unable to take the prescription to my local pharmacy as again, there was no parking at all in the vicinity. I ended up driving to a local supermarket some miles away (whilst not feeling well) and getting it from there. How are the local roads, local parking provision and doctors surgery supposed to cope with any amount of new houses?? The example above is not a one off. This is a regular thing, access to the shops on Wharf Road is chaos, so much so that we avoid shopping there. How can that be right?

It’s not just the obvious things like getting a doctor’s appointment. The council are great and provide recycling facilities, one such one being in the car park on Ash Hill Road. These facilities are often full to the brim – again I am not criticising the council but I am asking you how a development of “up to 115” houses expects a local community to continue to function when already under such pressure? Let’s not forget the local schools as well, it is not realistic to think they could accept more children.

Traffic – DON’T GET ME STARTED ON TRAFFIC. The local roads during rush hour (which is in fact rush morning and rush afternoon – it is not restricted to an hour) is hideous. The area comes to a standstill. Often the longest part of my commute is getting in and out of Ash (and I don’t need to get through the level crossing). Local roads simply can’t cope with any more traffic. I only travel 12 miles to work but due to local traffic I leave before 7am, far earlier than needed just to compensate.

If any development is to go ahead the local road infrastructure needs review and improvement beforehand, the traffic lights at the junction of the Guildford road and the Pirbright road on the A323 along with the level crossing on the A323 need addressing as these are both severe bottlenecks. Additionally cars currently park along Foreman Road causing a width restriction - this road and the surrounding village roads (e.g Grange road) are unlikely to be able to manage increased traffic, and any increase will severely impact the people who currently reside there.

In an ideal world people would use more public transport HOWEVER, when we used our local railway station (Ash) to travel we paid a fortune for seats, only for there to be standing room only and an uncomfortable, expensive, potentially dangerous journey. It’s hardly encouraging and not a suitable alternative if the services aren’t able to cope either. This is not speculation, this is a real example. We would need more train carriages added to services passing through Ash.

I am not aware of the flooding issues in the area but I am aware that when it rains the water pours off the Ash Ranges, down Brackendene (private road) and towards the area you are referring to. We can literally watch it washing the road away. If our village open space is built on where will the surface water go? With flooding on the increase in places it has not flooded before how will the area (the new development and beyond) be protected? This is a very real concern.
I will leave my comments there, it would have been easy to send you a list of bullet points with the usual traffic, doctors, schools etc. but I wanted to relate the information to real situations. We live here, we experience the actual frustrations on a daily basis. All I can see at the moment is that this proposed development would have a negative impact. Unfortunately we have looked at your website https://www.sites.google.com/site/foremanroadash/home but it lacks proper detail which would help us make more meaningful comments or see a better side. What detail is provided is frustrating E.G. you can’t zoom in on the maps, the key is totally unreadable. Statements like “up to 115” and “Each home will be provided with car parking” are far too vague. How many parking spaces would a property with 5 bedrooms have for example? If I was being cynical I would say that the website is there to “tick a box” rather than to provide any meaningful content or attract any helpful suggestions!

Please listen to the comments made and offer real, actual solutions to the real, actual problems that exist and will be made worse. Comments such as “There is the future ability to put in place a pedestrian crossing over the railway line, should the Council decide to deliver this facility.” are laughable. What does that actually mean in real terms?..NOTHING.. This would need to happen.. and before the houses are built. Not years afterwards if at all..

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The traffic problem in Guildford is huge. The slightest problem on the A3 or any other approach road means the whole town can and does come to a standstill. This is not just about people sitting in their cars going nowhere, it's about the health and wellbeing of those of us, and our children, who already live, work and go to school on the congested roads, breathing the fumes and particulates that are generated by the ever increasing traffic.

It is about our lives. This town cannot take another 20,000 or more cars trying to get into and out of it and the infrastructure cannot cope.

Please stop this nonsense now.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Specific Issues

Traffic and parking: Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected.

Local Road Network: In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that "consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed". It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/351  Respondent: 15133377 / Joyce Vincente  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Schools: Local schools are already at capacity – where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project.

Medical facilities: Similar situation to the schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/354  Respondent: 15133377 / Joyce Vincente  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I feel that the local services, such as education, council and health services will be put under undue pressure and will suffer, meaning local residents will also suffer.

The previous proposal was rejected before because the local environment could not cope with the pressure that would be put on it. Nothing has changed .... We should not made to go through the process again -the decision should remain 'NO'.

Comment ID: PSLPP16/364  Respondent: 15135937 / Charles Crane  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/365  Respondent: 15136097 / Peter Fava  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to confirm my total opposition to your local plan for the area surrounding Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common. The proposed increase in population of approximately 25%, without any significant improvements in the local infrastructure, is totally unacceptable. It is over 30 years since any reasonable improvements were made to the local roads, schools or the hospital. Our one and only surgery is now at maximum capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/912  Respondent: 15136513 / Ian Mitchell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/913  Respondent: 15136513 / Ian Mitchell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/388  Respondent: 15137057 / Ian Phillipson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Road Network  The present roads in the area are already suffering from heavy traffic. The proposed housing developments will considerably increase the problem - especially if the Wisley development goes ahead. It appears that little attention has been directed at the management of traffic in this area. How will the road system be able to deal with the problem?

Parking  If one assumes that every new house proposed has at least two cars, this will mean that the villages will have to cope with 6000 more cars. Think of the impact on local traffic and the need for car parking areas.

Facilities  Local schools are already full - where will all the extra children be taught? The present medical facilities are at full capacity, and we know the great pressure there is at the moment on GPs. How is this problem to be addressed?

Transport  How will the stations at Horsley and Effingham cope with a passenger load which now results in packed trains at commuting times?

This is a summary of my main concerns over The Plan. In essence, I, and my neighbours consider that the problems being presented have not been given the serious attention that they really deserve and there appears to be an unstoppable force behind it all!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/393  Respondent: 15137409 / Mark Costello  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of schools and Doctors surgeries etc if this housing is approved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/407  Respondent: 15137825 / Lianne Sherlock  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The impact on the community would be huge and the already stretched infrastructure such as doctors surgeries and schools would drown under the proposed plan.

Please confirm receipt of my objection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10924  Respondent: 15138273 / David Latin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Schools:** Local schools are already at capacity – where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project.

**Medical facilities:** Similar situation to the schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/423  **Respondent:** 15138433 / Sylvia Pyne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This will make the A247 almost impossible to use safely for crossing and the pollution will be increased dramatically. We seem to be selected because we are at the north end of the borough and other parts will not be affected by the fumes, or inconvenienced by the extra traffic which will come through the village to get to and from Woking.

I object to Send being taken out of the Green Belt. This will increase the potential for even more new housing than the existing proposals and and the rebuilt school will not have enough capacity for all the children who will move into, or will be born in the village. (policy P2 page 48)

I object to a new junction for the A3 being built at Send. (policy A43a page 223) Again this will increase traffic which wants to go to London coming through the village.

I feel that the other parts of Guildford should take up a larger part of the new development, which as the plans stand will swamp our village.

I wish my comments to be seen by the inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/435  **Respondent:** 15138849 / Anne Walters  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of consideration given for the already congested roads along the A3 and M25

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9684  **Respondent:** 15140065 / Daron Jones  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of consideration given for the already congested roads along the A3 and M25

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Just emailing my protest at all the houses you want to build in send marsh and the surrounding areas, not only is this area already over populated and trying to get from home to work in rush hour is manic as it is, and you want to add more congestion and add the the problems, it's crazy! We also have a hard enough time trying to get an appointment at the doctors surgery so adding more people to this area will be making matters worse than what they already are, same goes with the schools, this is an increasing problem

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We are already struggling to provide good quality education to our children locally and the increase in housing will only add to this pressure, not to mention the burden on local infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/453  Respondent: 15140801 / Penny Alison  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to lodge my objection to the Draft Local Plan.

I recognise that more housing is needed but the plans for the Lovelace Ward are entirely impractical - as recently evidenced by the unanimous rejection of the plans by Guildford Borough Council planners.

The reasons for my objection are many but are dominated by concerns over traffic in this area. Already, at all times of the day, the roads are at maximum capacity. A short time spent at both the A3/M25 junction and Ripley High Street would immediately prove the point.

The principal grounds for my objection are:

1. DAILY TRAFFIC CHAOS would inevitably ensue on roads that are already overloaded and frequently subject to long queues and traffic jams. Indeed, Junction 10 of the M25 features frequently on national traffic reports.
2. OVERLOADING OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT, SCHOOLS, HEALTH SERVICES and PUBLIC SERVICES, all of which are already at maximum capacity and subject to lengthy waiting times.
3. AIR POLLUTION from thousands more cars. Why consider creating the same problems with which London is currently having to contend?

If there is any concern at all in the council for the quality of life of residents and our environment, this plan will be rejected forthwith.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9686  Respondent: 15140833 / Tim Whiting  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The disregard for infrastructure needs to support these proposals, including overloaded schools, doctors surgeries, hospital capacity, roads and public transport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/481  Respondent: 15141665 / Paul Walsh  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing with reference to the New Local Plan 2016. It would unthinkable to allow these developments to happen. The roads around Horsley cannot cope with the influx of new homes in the villages. Schools are already oversubscribed and this would put added pressure on them. The village cannot withstand another 533 homes being built. It is just not possible. The infrastructure is just not there.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/501  Respondent: 15143073 / Sharon Rankin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the environmental impact due to more cars on the road I object to the congestion caused due to the scale of buildings work

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/502  Respondent: 15143137 / Katie Zimmer  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to express my concern and opposition at the prospect of you building more properties on the area surrounding the Hog's Back.

Guildford itself is already unable to cope with the amount of traffic it already suffers. Building a further 1800 homes, with, presumably, an average of 2 cars per household, this will only make matters considerably worse. I drive across the Hog's Back every day and it is unbearable as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/504  Respondent: 15143265 / Steve Hartnell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The removal of East and West Horsley from the Green Belt and the proposition that 533 new houses be built in these crowded villages is excessive and unreasonable. The infrastructure and amenities are insufficient to support anything other than modest infill housing consistent with the existing status of these villages in the Green Belt. Roads are already busy and car parking facilities at the village shops and station would be overwhelmed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/513  Respondent: 15143553 / Danielle Rixon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I feel the main trunk roads, A3 and M25 are already at maximum capacity and increased traffic and pollution would be detrimental to all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/515  Respondent: 15143649 / Noah James  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the number of houses proposed, the infrastructure limits cannot be ignored.
The scale of the home building project proposed is my biggest concern. The current infrastructure is already stretched with schools at full capacity, medical facilities are much the same with appointments impossible to get, the impact on the local road network which will have unthinkably high levels of traffic and a severe lack of parking. Everyday life will be impacted and even the usually pleasant commuting to London will be a misery with nowhere to park and fuller trains. These problems will only be enhanced by the proposed developments and they cannot be ignored.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/517  Respondent: 15143713 / Naomi James  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the number of houses proposed, the infrastructure is already limited.
The amount of houses proposed in the building programme is far too many for the current and proposed infrastructure. Medical facilities and schools are at full capacity, the local road network will suffer even higher levels of traffic and
there will not be sufficient parking. People will struggle to find a space at the station and even if they do, trains into London and other transport will become over crowded.

My husband and I chose to raise a family in a peaceful and green environment, this proposed plan contradicts everything good about East and West Horsley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/518  Respondent: 15143809 / Cathy Leblanc  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed Local Plan which Guildford Borough Council published and this email outlines my reasons.

I object to the number of homes proposed.
Quite simply there are too many houses proposed in this plan.
We haven't got the infrastructure in place nor will the proposed infrastructure adequately satisfy the number of people the added homes will bring. With an average of 2-3 cars per family that could be 6,000 extra cars on the road, the local road network couldn't cope with the high levels of traffic and the current insufficient parking means finding a space at the doctors, shops or train station would be impossible. The transport overcrowding would make local and London commuting uncomfortable. The medical facilities and schools are at full capacity and these extra homes would only create a larger problem for everyone, the proposal doesn't enrich the community in any way.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/521  Respondent: 15143841 / Colin Taylor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Therefore I strongly object to the 2016 draft local "Plan". In part because of the catastrophic effect that removing the three villages would have, but also because the "Plan" clearly includes minimal improvements in infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/529  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy A44 - I object to the proposed development for housing and travellers pitches in Send Hill for the following reasons.

This is again a newly identified site and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft; it has not previously been consulted on and is therefore inappropriate to include it in this consultation.

Send Hill is a quiet residential road surrounded by countryside. There is insufficient access to the proposed site, it is inappropriate for the proposed purposes and not in keeping with the area. Indeed other private local planning applications have been turned down for this reason. The subsoil of the site contains documented unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The road is narrow, single track in places, with no footpaths and as the road is straight it is already used as a rat run for some vehicles to cut through to the A3.

The road is used by the George Abbott school bus and many school children walk along Send Hill to meet the bus at the junction with the A247. Additionally younger children walk with families to attend the primary school currently in Bush Lane at the end of Send Hill. Even when the school moves to its new site the children will still be walking along Send Hill to attend it. Increased housing and the resulting traffic will place these children at added risk. Indeed rather than building more homes Send Hill should be subjected to traffic calming measures to protect the children who walk to school and other residents.

Send Hill is home to a number of bats who require protection from development and there are native bluebells in the woodland which also need to be protected.

To conclude my objection to the plan I would like to mention the local services such as health centres and schools which are already under a huge burden.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17828</th>
<th>Respondent: 15144065 / Margaret Heard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please seriously consider my objections against the plans and policies specified, as I strongly believe they are in the best interest for the communities, people, wildlife, heritage and future of the Ripley, Send and Clandon areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/536</th>
<th>Respondent: 15144161 / Karen Patterson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/545</th>
<th>Respondent: 15144225 / Donald Pitts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object because I believe the proposals will increase congestion on trunk roads (A3/M25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I object because I believe the proposals will increase congestion on local village roads and lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I object because I believe our local roads are unsuitable for heavy vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I object because I am concerned about the impact on air quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I object because there is a lack of proper infrastructure planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I object because there is insufficient utilities capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I object because I believe local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I object because I believe local social welfare facilities will be overwhelmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I object because I believe local policing will be inadequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I object because I believe local shops and restaurants will be overwhelmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I object because I believe there will be parking problems in local villages caused by larger populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I object because I believe sites are being planned in unsustainable locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Attached documents: |
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/546  Respondent: 15144225 / Donald Pitts  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object because I believe insufficient protection and consideration is being given to heritage assets
2. I object because I believe insufficient protection and consideration is being given to the environment
3. I object because I believe the developments proposed constitute overdevelopment
4. I object because I believe the needs of existing local communities are not being addressed
5. I object to the poor quality of layout and housing design proposed
6. I object because insufficient consideration has been given to SPA, SSI and Conservation Area issues
7. I object because there is a lack of proper cycle lanes on local roads
8. I object because there is a lack of proper pedestrian footpaths on local roads

Please ensure my objections are considered as part of the consultation process and made available to the Inspector in due course.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/551  Respondent: 15144545 / Stacey Maxwell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Lack of proper infrastructure
As with all large housing developments, no thought is ever given to the current infrastructure. Schools and doctors surgeries, to give just 2 important examples, are already at breaking point so how will building the amount of houses proposed in the Local Plan alleviate this? Put simply, it won’t. Much more thought has to be given to the local existing residents and impact on their quality of life. For these reasons, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

Impact on utilities
The villages that surround these strategic sites are already close to capacity in terms of the electrical network and sewers so building a development such as Garlick’s Arch will have a catastrophic effect on these essential utilities. For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

Lack of public transport
The sites at Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch are in totally unsustainable locations as they are not close to railway stations. Our bus timetable between Woking and Guildford is being reduced even further this year so that in turn means residents are going to be more reliant on their cars. For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

Impact on local policing services
With funding being cut to police services, how will building large developments, such as Garlick’s Arch and Wisley
Airfield help? Put simply, it won’t. For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/554</th>
<th>Respondent: 15144545 / Stacey Maxwell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Insufficient pedestrian footpaths/cycle lanes on local roads

With increased congestion which will be caused by building large sites, such as Wisley Airfield or Garlick’s Arch, this will have major ramifications for existing residents. Our footpaths are insufficient now so increasing the amount of vehicles on the roads will increase the danger to pedestrians. There are many cyclists who like to use the local roads, for which we don’t have cycle lanes. Is it worth risking human life to build such unsuitable developments? For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/557</th>
<th>Respondent: 15144641 / Andy Doughty</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also have grave concerns over the community should the development proceed, in particular in relation to schools, medical facilities and local roads, all of which are already under immense strain.

School places are already at a premium and any additional development would decrease availability.

I have attempted to make medical appointments recently and have only been successful on two occasions, any development may reduce that success further.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/570</th>
<th>Respondent: 15145089 / linda brockey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wish to register my opposition to the local plan re: the Horsleys.
The boundaries of our villages will be greatly enlarged. The village areas inside these boundaries will be removed from the Green Belt. The Horsleys are likely to have more than 533 new houses - we do not have the facilities or infrastructure to support this growth. Our local schools, roads and doctors are already at breaking point!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18704  Respondent: 15145377 / WYG (S Fidgett)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy 11 ‘Infrastructure and Delivery’

5.19 It is acknowledged and accepted that development should provide for the infrastructure requirements that arise from it. Priority should be given to those sites that can support the provision of infrastructure in key urban locations, where they benefit most people.

5.20 It is of significant concern that the development of the housing needed and the related employment and other facilities is in effect held back in terms of the housing trajectory, by the rate at which infrastructure can be delivered. We are also concerned that this may not be effective given the size of the funding gap that has been identified in the background to the Local Plan and will in effect, prevent delivery of the Local Plan’s housing and other commitments.

5.21 While the size of the funding gap is a concern and may undermine the effectiveness and soundness of the Local Plan, it is also the case that the reliance on CIL for part of this, detaches delivery of infrastructure from the delivery of housing. In effect, housing would be consented under the terms of CIL and a resultant payment made, without there being a commitment to the timing and delivery of the related infrastructure. While there is a clear intention and link, no guarantee exists and it is not considered possible to delay permission or condition this on the actions of a third party providing the relevant infrastructure. This is an issue for the plan to resolve.

5.22 Ultimately, sites should be identified that focus the support for and investment in essential infrastructure within and around the urban area of Guildford. This maximises the potential that the infrastructure will come forward, will benefit the most people within the Borough and any funding gaps are minimised.

5.23 Contributions should clearly only be sought where they are (i) necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms; (ii) directly related to the development; and (iii) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed. In this respect they have to be compliant with the CIL regulations.

5.24 Consideration also needs to be had to the viability of providing for infrastructure, which needs to be weighed against the very real need for housing and employment in the Borough. To this end any future policy documents in relation to infrastructure should have full consideration of paragraph 173 of the NPPF which states that that sites and the scale of development identified in a plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens where their ability to be developed viably is threatened. This also relates to affordable housing requirements sought from allocations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/599  Respondent: 15146689 / Alex Barber  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
1. **Inadequate consideration given to Infrastructure Delivery.** I reaffirm my objections to the revised plan for the Former Wisley Airfield/Three Farms Meadow site at Ockham. Despite having been previously unanimously rejected by Guildford Borough Council planners, it has not only been included, but enlarged on the new draft plan. Inadequate consideration is being given to supporting services, including schools, medical centres, public transport including rail capacity and railway station parking, which are already overloading. Housing growth needs to be organic and sustainable in the context of other resources; this development is not. The viability of the proposal also relies upon the Road Investment Strategy by the UK Highways Agency to develop the A3/M25 interchange. These have not been finalised, and do not consider the additional burden created by the Wisley Airfield, Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Hill developments which are explicitly designed to empty their traffic burden onto that interchange. Four thousand or more extra cars using this intersection every morning and evening will cause chaos. The natural consequence of this overloading will be the overspill onto trunk roads and minor lanes, which not only are not designed for such heavy use. There will be increased risk to vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, riders and cyclists on crowded routes with no footway and few cycle tracks.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1444  
Respondent: 15146945 / E J M Symonds  
Agent:

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Our village has not the roads of the facilities of schools of doctors surgeries to withstand the new Local Plan which was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/618  
Respondent: 15147329 / Brenda Holliday  
Agent:

**Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I'm in my 70's, so I have to use the doctors surgery in Normandy. At present I have to wait 3-5 days for an appointment. What will happen when upwards of 3,000 people move to the area?

My next door neighbour is a school teacher as is my daughter and they both tell me their schools do not have enough children in them and worry they could lose their jobs, or worse still close down. A school in this housing estate would be very foolish knowing there are vacancies in all parts of Guildford and a total waste of money.

I believe those that have drawn-up the Local Plan have not taken into account the demographics of the proposed land in Normandy and have chosen for what ever reason to over-look roads, flooding and the basic infrastructure of this area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/626  Respondent: 15147457 / Penny Battes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our objection is to the erosion of the Green Belt, lack of evidence for the alleged housing need numbers and lack of proposed provision for amenities such as schools and gp surgeries.

I send this e-mail on behalf of my mother, my husband and myself and hope very much that our views will be taken into consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/636  Respondent: 15147617 / Patrick Fossett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objections to the present plans for development in the Ripley/Send/Wisley area. There are many reasons for this but the principal ones are overcrowding, traffic flows on local and trunk roads and removal of land from the green belt.

If you need more details I will be happy to write several pages, but I expect that this simple mail will suffice.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1315  Respondent: 15147809 / Elmbridge Borough Council (Suzanne Parkes)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy ID1 – Infrastructure and delivery

Clarification is sort as to the interaction of points 3, 4 and 4 of this Policy. Points 3 and 5 relate specifically to planning applications with Point 3 stating that if the provision of infrastructure necessary to support new development cannot be secured, planning permission will be refused. However, this appears to be contradicted in Point 5 where it is suggested that regard will be had to the delivery and timing of delivery of the key infrastructure but does not necessarily constitute a refusal. The difference appears to be reference to ‘key infrastructure’. However, given the significance of the timely delivery of key infrastructure this point is considered to be even more pertinent.
It is also considered that the Policy would read better if the planning application and Local Plan elements were more clearly distinguished.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5330</th>
<th>Respondent: 15147841 / N Golbengian</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/647</th>
<th>Respondent: 15148705 / Catriona Wilkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition I object to Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch, as the proposal to build at least 400 homes and industrial facilities will not only put impossible pressure on the existing road network, but other infrastructure such as schools and medical facilities will be insufficient to support this development. The Villages Medical Centre in Send is already at capacity and there is no secondary school proposed for Ripley and Send which even now causes problems for many children who are unable to get in to the already oversubscribed closest secondary school George Abbot in Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/654</th>
<th>Respondent: 15150433 / Alex Richardson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Proposed creation of new north & southbound slip roads to and from the A3 to the A247 Clandon Road (Policy A43A) at Burnt Common. This is totally unacceptable and will destroy the village, surrounding area and quality of life.

c) Infrastructure – There are not enough primary and secondary school places as it is for the residents of Send and Ripley. What proposals are in place for school paces for an extra 400 + children at least, not just for the immediate future but the next 5/10/15 years? If this proposal is pushed through then new schools will need to be built concurrent to the proposed
housing, otherwise there will be serious issues for residents. It is also virtually impossible to get to see a doctor at The Villages Medical Centre – not only can you never get through on the phone, but when you can you not get an appointment. They cannot cope with the volume of residents without hundreds or potentially thousands of additional residents – and their children etc.

I strongly object to these proposed developments and also to the lack of consideration given to the residents and their concerns, the limited consultation period and the lack of planning for the adverse effects on infrastructure these developments will have on the surrounding area. Please take on board the fears and concerns of your local residents, these proposals will kill our village and the wider area. If these proposals are followed through there is no hope for this area or our county as a whole, little by little the green belt will be destroyed and we will eventually become a suburb of London with no country side, no wildlife and no way of ever getting back what we have lost.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12880  Respondent: 15150465 / L Williams  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I was born in Guildford and view with horror the plans proposed to build so many extra houses. The congestion at present brings traffic to a standstill I can't imagine what it would be like with so many extra houses and cars. The hospitals, schools, doctors and surgeries would be pushed to the limit I hope these problems can be sorted and we can continue to have a pleasant town to live in for the future. JUDY NETTO.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/659  Respondent: 15150593 / Janna McClean  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Lack of provision for new schools.
2. Lack of provision for Doctors surgeries.
3. The inclusion of the rejected Wisley plan from the Cayman Island Company.
4. I voted for a conservative Guildford Council and did expect this breach of trust in the complete decimation of the Green Belt.
5. As all of us who are resident in the area know only too well the total infrastructure is already at breaking point, roads rail schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/665  Respondent: 15150785 / Natasha Dillon  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/3555  
**Respondent:** 15150817 / Robert Winborn  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - We do not have the infrastructure to support the new developments e.g. medical centres, dentists, schools etc. - there are already insufficient places at the Raleigh school to service the Horsleys - adding up to another 533 houses will create real problems  
- Any increase in housing would result in insufficient parking at Horsley station which would be a daily inconvenience for a number of existing residents  
**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  
**Attached documents:** |

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/666  
**Respondent:** 15150913 / Peter Hamilton  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9) I OBJECT TO the development of so many houses in one area of the Borough, schools Public Services medical facilities are stretched cannot take any increase.  
**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  
**Attached documents:** |

The failure of GBC to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) which shows an 80% reduction in employment space from the previous ELNA carried out by GBC in 2013. This means that industrial space at Burnt Common is no longer needed. Housing numbers from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 (SHMA) are highly questionable. The number of foreign students has been wrongly used to inflate the need. The required 13,860 houses in the Local Plan is exaggerated. If the population is to grow by some 20,000 in the Plan period, 8,000 homes would be needed based on an average of 2.5 persons per home. The Green Belt does not need to be built over and half of new homes could be built on brownfield sites. It appears that GBC’s Transport Assessment was not even available to councillors for the vote taken on 24th May and this was only published on 6th June with infrastructure overload receiving scant attention. None of these proposals are in the best interests of Send and its residents and any change to its Green Belt status would greatly diminish the character and identity of the village. In addition, the general strain on the infrastructure of the village in terms of roads, schooling and medical services would be overwhelming. Already in Send, traffic is heavy at certain times of day, schools over-subscribed and The Villages Medical Centre struggles to provide timely appointments for the residents currently registered. I trust these objections are received and noted in accordance with procedure and look forward to news arising from the reassessment which will surely be necessary once the full extent of the resistance of local residents to the Local Plan proposals is known to GBC.  
**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  
**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/719</th>
<th>Respondent: 15155201 / Ann Lay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.) Due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure. (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/725</th>
<th>Respondent: 15155201 / Ann Lay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.) The lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/727</th>
<th>Respondent: 15155201 / Ann Lay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.) Parking issues in local villages caused by a larger population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.) Local healthcare facilities becoming overwhelmed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/743</th>
<th>Respondent: 15155617 / David Vallath-Patel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road &amp; Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/744  Respondent: 15155617 / David Vallath-Patel  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/770  Respondent: 15157505 / Linda Leunissen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

There is too much traffic in our villages already (ever tried driving from Pyrford into Ripley and onto Portsmouth road without scratching up your car?) and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/787  Respondent: 15157665 / James Laing  Agent: |  |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 |  |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |  |
| I object to the building of homes without due thought for school journeys. These represent a large proportion of traffic during rush hours, and the dependency of our children on parents to ferry them around. We should encourage housing to be built near schools or new schools to be built so that children can travel short distances by green transport. |  |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |  |
| Attached documents: |  |

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/804  Respondent: 15159905 / Vicky Smith  Agent: |  |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 |  |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |  |
| 1. I OBJECT TO THE LACK OF IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR NEW SCHOOLS |  |
| 1. I OBJECT TO THE LACK OF ANY IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR DOCTORS SURGERIES |  |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |  |
| Attached documents: |  |

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/810  Respondent: 15160769 / Elliott Stuart  Agent: |  |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 |  |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |  |
It is already hard to get a GP appointment, to get your child a place at the school locally, to travel around the area because of so much traffic, so why make things worse within these local villages? The roads are already too dangerous for me to cycle on because there are so many cars, without adding to these by building lots of smaller developments all over the place - why not concentrate on the bigger brownfield sites?

Please ensure that my comments are available for the Independent Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15536</th>
<th>Respondent: 15172641 / Michael Heard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Newark Lane, I am only too aware of the already overloaded narrow country roads - local development on the scale proposed would be unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/892</th>
<th>Respondent: 15176161 / Linda Fielding</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1529</th>
<th>Respondent: 15177537 / Elizabeth Guest</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although Guildford Borough Council state there will be increased investment in infrastructure we currently see very little of this in East &amp; West Horsley. Roads are at a dangerous level of disrepair which is damaging vehicles which increases the risks of accidents. Drainage is poor particularly on Ockham Road Road where drains regularly flood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Roads and Drainage in East & West Horsley are in very poor condition and severely under pressure in our current environment. I fear the dramatic increase in housing will cause even further problems as the Council have failed to resolve the existing issues therefore I do not see an evidence to show this will be improved in the future.

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In addition to poor roads and drainage the current infrastructure in East & West Horsley does not support the plan. Although the Council mentioned a new primary and secondary school and even if these were built our roads, rail and public transport wouldn't be able to support the impact causing gridlock throughout the village. Our medical centre in East Horsley is severely under pressure as it is and therefore further extensions would be required however this would only follow in 5-10 year time after massive development has taken place showing a complete lack of support to the community.

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7) lack of immediate provision needed for new schools
8) lack of any immediate provision for doctors surgery
10) increased traffic that would be cause in which a village such as Ripley already cannot sustain its current demand without long tailback and
11) dangerous size vehicals manoeuvring in roads that has little or no pedestrian path way due to increased traffic
12) lack of parking in the village for the present day users let alone if more were to be housed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/966</th>
<th>Respondent: 15185537 / Peter Mills</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong> I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1), as there is too much traffic in our villages already.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/969</th>
<th>Respondent: 15185537 / Peter Mills</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **J.** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)  
Insufficient infrastructure improvements are planned to support the development. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity. |

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1021</th>
<th>Respondent: 15189377 / Anne Butler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The doctors surgery, schooling and local facilities in the Horsleys are already struggling to cope with the current population and it is not clear how much new infrastructure is proposed despite the large number of houses suggested. Whilst I understand that the provision of these facilities may not be the responsibility of GBC, it is unacceptable not to include consideration of them in the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1029</th>
<th>Respondent: 15192161 / Alex Shafee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )


I object strongly to the ill-conceived plans for East and West Horsley, effectively making them into small towns.

**Infrastructure**

East Road/The Street and Ockham Road around the station and shops are busy all the time, backing up repeatedly during rush hours and school runs making them unsafe for cyclists, especially children. Few children are now able to cycle to school.

A considerable number of roads in the villages are ill-repaired and can only suffer further with increased traffic. We don't have many buses through the villages so each new house is likely to have at least one car, probably two.

The junction with the A3 at the Wisley roundabout is already stretched and backs up much of the day, but particularly between 6am and 9.30am.

Parking by the shops and village halls in both villages, and by the surgery and the station are already over-subscribed at most times of day.

**Drainage**

Recently built houses in West Horsley have had trouble the disposal of surface water. This will get increasingly bad as more and more foundations are dug. It is also possible that the existing drainage systems will not cope.

**Services**

The Raleigh School is still over subscribed, as it has been for twenty years. Are plans in place to increase local schooling? I think not. Nearby secondary schools are also over-subscribed leading to long journeys for 11+ children and additional traffic.

It is difficult to get an appointment with a preferred GP.

East and West Horsley are in danger of being turned into off-shoots of Cobham and Guildford. There are all too few villages left on the outskirts of London. We should be saving those we have left.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1114  **Respondent:** 15195969 / Carrie Wheeler  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object therefore to the number of developments planned in such a relatively small area, the infrastructure in around Send and Ripley, can only just about cope at present! An appointment at our local Doctors surgery can mean a wait of well over a week, the local schools are stretched to find places for the local children and then there's the traffic! The roads in the morning are jam packed queues common place and the roadways themselves damaged through volume of traffic and lack of maintenance. So how on earth are we going to accommodate another several hundred homes!
I object to the council viewing our villages as the answer to the housing needs of the area. The transport links from Send and Ripley are poor to say the least. The buses run once an hour, so without a car to get to a railway station or towns such as Woking or Guildford would be very difficult. So how are all these new home owners going to get to work as with the increased traffic no one would get anywhere there'd be total gridlock!

I object to the lack of foresight given to the infrastructure required to accommodate all these additional families, where would the children go to school? How would you ever get a Doctors appointment? The roads would be permanently blocked and therefore become damaged, local shops could not provide for the demand, and as I mentioned earlier there is a very limited bus service.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1118  Respondent: 15196097 / Mark Groves and Katie Hamilton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1143  Respondent: 15196449 / Fran Jepson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Lack of essential infrastructure. Where are the schools going to be built to accommodate the instant growth in the population? Our schools in and around Burpham are already stretched to breaking point, with most of them having taken extra form intake for the past few years. Burpham Primary is a prime example. There was obviously no thought given to the extra traffic a further form intake would cause across the board. What was a lovely village primary school is now an impersonal business venture that over the past 4 years has gained 120+ students, and will gain virtually 100 more over the coming years. Boxgrove has also increased in size as well as other primary schools. Where will the children go when the move up to senior school? Bus routes have also been adjusted/reduced making parents drive their children to school thus creating more traffic.
• Also, where are the new doctors? Increasing new housing by 693 pa, which incidentally is double that of the 322 put forward in the 2012 plan is not sustainable. Why has this number doubled and where will the influx of people come from that this extra 371 houses per annum suggests is necessary?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPP16/1152  Respondent: 15196513 / Alison Precious  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools
2. I object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1177  Respondent: 15197761 / M B Kelly  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This is a plan which is going to completely ruin an area
1) lack of green belt protection
2) over loading of schools, health services and public transport
3) pedestrian and cyclist safety will be compromised

I strongly object to this whole planning GBC Plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1174  Respondent: 15198177 / David Appleby  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Having moved to West Horsley 38 years ago to escape the urban sprawl of suburbia, the exact same thing seems to be about to happen in the Horsleys if the new local plan is implemented. There are already problems with parking at East Horsley medical centre, Horsley railway station and the local shops

The roads adjoining the Raleigh school get choked up twice a day with school traffic already. With the inevitable increase in traffic that 533 new houses will bring, this is another situation that can only get worse.

The amount of heavy goods traffic using Ockham Road South and Ockham Road North as a short cut between the A246 and the A3 at Wisley has increased quite significantly and there are sections of Ockham Road South that are too narrow
for this kind of traffic. There is also a problem on this road with the surface water not draining away efficiently, resulting in any pedestrians who are trying to get to Horsley station, the medical centre and the local shops having to run the gauntlet of being splashed and soaked by the passing traffic.

It would appear that the existing drainage infrastructure is not capable of dealing with the current surface and waste water problem. This situation will not be improved by concreting over large areas of green belt land and replacing it with high density housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attended documents:
1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1190  Respondent: 15198401 / Tony Porter  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I OBJECT TO the lack of immediate provision for new schools.
- I OBJECT TO the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1202  Respondent: 15205729 / John Walker  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Glandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1223  Respondent: 15205729 / John Walker  Agent:
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy 11)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick's Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:
   1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
   2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
   3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
   4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
   5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
   6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the congestion that such development of this magnitude would cause to local village roads (Policy 11) There is too much traffic in the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already and the rural roads are narrow, in need of repair and without footpaths in many places. More houses will mean dangerous traffic conditions. Pity the poor cyclists as well as other road users.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1256  Respondent: 15207713 / Amec Foster Wheeler (Robert Deanwood)  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1289  Respondent: 15215841 / Andrew Boyce  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the complete lack of consideration of the impact of these proposals on highways, education, transport or medical services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16399  Respondent: 15216129 / Timothy Hewlett  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous traffic.
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development envisaged in the plan. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the huge scale of development envisaged in the plan

1. Congestion on the local village roads and lanes

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day. For example the Newark Lane and Rose Lane junction in the center of Ripley, which at peak hours, is regularly gridlocked due to the volume of traffic, made
worse when Ripley High Street (B2215) is used as a detour/slip road when the A3 is jammed. I object to further development which will cause even greater congestion in and around our villages.

1. **Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic**

Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. Furthermore, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

1. **Poor air quality concerns**

Further congestion, particularly in built up residential areas will only lead to greater levels of air pollution. I object to further development, which will result a fall in the air quality.

1. **Sites being planned in unsustainable locations**

Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on cars. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

1. **Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population**

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems, to which I object.

1. **Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed**

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object to the further stress it will put upon existing overstretched health services.

1. **Local schooling facilities will be overwhelmed**

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new schooling, existing schools will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1313</th>
<th>Respondent: 15220097 / Douglas Barr Trudy Amos</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

9. We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

10. We object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. We have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars;
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads;
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements;
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them);
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest;
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1382  Respondent: 15227585 / Kelly Bartlett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars;
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads;
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements;
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them);
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest;
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1390  Respondent: 15227617 / James Pask  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junctions as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1505</th>
<th>Respondent: 15227617 / James Pask</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road I specifically object to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The increased volume of car A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1393  **Respondent:** 15227905 / Nigel Alexander  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road Ispecifically object to:
   1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
   2. The increased volume of car A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
   3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
   4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
   5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
   6. The lack of suitable public The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13756  **Respondent:** 15227905 / Nigel Alexander  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY)

• Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
• Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
• Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
• Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
• No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.
There has been insufficient or no thought or planning for improved infrastructure to sustain normal living requirements. It is unreasonable to believe that unless there is a radical change to road and transport services, education facilities, medical services, drainage and water supply the planned increase in house density will not be sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1425  Respondent: 15231233 / Jenny Bridge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan strongly. I am extremely concerned with regard to the following points:

1. The infrastructure including schools, medical facilities, public transport provision, road network etc are at capacity already and the proposed plan would push these beyond any reasonable demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1455  Respondent: 15233441 / John Mason  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure:

Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane, which on the Plan are either side of the proposed project are totally incapable of taking the construction and subsequent residential traffic.

Westwood Lane has an irrevocable, narrow one way system under the railway bridge and on Glaziers Lane the bridge has a bend and blind spot.

The A323, the fundamental service and main traffic route through the village is extremely busy, speed limits are ignored and the main junctions are both potentially and actually dangerous.

There is no opportunity, without significant housing demolition to improve these routes and junctions which would be essential to attempt to accommodate an additional 2000 domestic and service vehicles.

Much of the proposed site is low lying and subject to flooding, the large increase in hard surfaces and the inability of the current surface and foul drainage systems to cope threatens a major disaster.

School:

Research by our County Councillor indicates that there is no fundamental need for a secondary school on the site and any calculation as to secondary education need will have to be revised downwards as a result of the Brexit decision.

The linkage of school need to Green Belt development is most definitely not proven.
Amenities:
Normandy is almost totally devoid of local amenities.
There is a perimeter bus and rail service, an overloaded doctors surgery, 2 churches and a well appointed village hall.
There are no services for the every day supply of food or drink.
All the latter needs are serviced outside the village requiring travel to access them

Clearly Guildford has a commitment to provide housing for an increasing population but there are two fundamentals that have not been addressed:-

What is the demand for housing going to be when immigration is brought under control, an area for recalculation of demand.

Secondly housing in Guildford is extremely expensive and likely to remain so, as a construction professional, I doubt if low cost housing can be built (if resources are available) that is truly affordable.

I urge that any significant development in Normandy is not implemented as the fundamentally flawed logic for a secondary school on Green Belt is not proved and therefore the surrounding development does not need to go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1498  Respondent: 15234529 / Oliver Pask  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/1568  Respondent: 15234849 / Alastair Fleming  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the impact that additional residents will have on local roads, health services, education spaces and policing needs

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1617  Respondent: 15240161 / R O Moore  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. Road congestion that development will cause to the local village roads because of lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in the villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition (eg Polesden Lane) and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1622  Respondent: 15240161 / R O Moore  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13. The lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

There are no adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical, emergency and other services to cover the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1633  Respondent: 15240673 / Chris Cook  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
There is no provision for improved road traffic access/facilities. The road conditions in East Lane reflect those of an undeveloped country!

There is no viable provision for additional infrastructure to accommodate the proposal; no references are made to mitigate for increased needs for improved public transport (bus and rail/rail parking), medical and educational needs (Primary & Secondary).

The increase in demand on existing shopping and parking facilities would prove highly detrimental to all those using them.

Waste water and sewage requirements are not adequately provisioned for and the inclusion of proposed builds in FRZ 2/3 are not suitably mitigated.

Please do not proceed with this ill conceived plan!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object that there are no plans to improve schools, medical services or the utilities which are almost at full capacity now. The local shops would not cope with the population increase as there is already serious congestion around local shops especially in Ripley and parking is a real problem with people parking in restricted areas just to be able to use the local amenities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network
1. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads on the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements

1. The absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)

1. The A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest. Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1751  Respondent: 15244641 / Wesley Raynbird-Tilbury  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY 11 -Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT. Most of the borough's infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan's commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

The plan targets greenfield sites-requiring heavy infrastructure investment-in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. 12 This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES

This section of the Proposed Submission Local Plan sets out details covering a range of infrastructure policies.

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3

These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst I support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give me cause for concern.

I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:
• Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
• The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
• Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;
• The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
• There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and
• The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools.

Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, EHPC believes that this needs to be done earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s.

I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I accordingly OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I further OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
1. INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES

This section of the Proposed Submission Local Plan sets out details covering a range of infrastructure policies.

POLICIES I1, I2 & I3

These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’ and Sustainable Transport. Whilst I support the general policy statements as presented in each case, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give me cause for concern.

I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools.

Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, EHPC believes that this needs to be done earlier.
Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s.

I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I accordingly OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I further OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1842  Respondent: 15248161 / Fabio Ligi  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object that all this development will crush our local infrastructure in terms of housing, doctors’ surgeries, hospitals, and all other local amenities. How will we cope with all this additional pressure on services?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1846  Respondent: 15248321 / Gordon Pipe  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No
Development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1857  
**Respondent:** 15248449 / Peter Bessler  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in these villages and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1862  
**Respondent:** 15248481 / Jamie McCallister  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.
How would Send, Send Marsh and Ripley cope with the extra traffic?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1867  Respondent: 15248481 / Jamie McCallister  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/329  Respondent: 15248481 / Jamie McCallister  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)
The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1897  Respondent: 15253217 / W Orchard  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.
The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle Lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1906</th>
<th>Respondent: 15253217 / W Orchard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1884  **Respondent:** 15253313 / J.J. Maguire  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the new local plan as follows

1. I object to the increase in the volume of **traffic** that so many new homes will generate.
2. I object because the **train services** at peak times will be overwhelmed. As it is one just about gets a seat at Horsley. By the time the train gets to Effingham and Cobham it is standing room only.
3. I object because the **infrastructure** proposals are inadequate. Where are the new **roads** going to come from?
4. I object because the **medical services** will be under increased strain. It is difficult getting a doctors appointment as it is.
5. I object because the **parking at the railway station** will be overwhelmed.
6. I object because the **parking provision at the village centre** will be unable to cope.
7. I object because **local schools** will be unable to cope.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1937  **Respondent:** 15254113 / R Orchard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.

The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1938  Respondent: 15254113 / R Orchard  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy 11)

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1925  Respondent: 15254305 / Ben Barnwell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
6) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---


Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1988  **Respondent:** 15256705 / R.V. Vickers  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

   Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

   Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

   I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

   Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

   With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

   The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

   The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

   Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

   Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

   Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

   Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2003  Respondent: 15256833 / C J Vickers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6695</th>
<th>Respondent: 15257217 / Rebecca Armitage</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **DRAINS, WATER SUPPLY, FLOOD RISK, CONGESTION**

   Our drainage system, our water supply, our medical facilities and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes West Horsley nor the extra homes on the Wisley airfield site.

   To increase the number of houses in West Horsley by 35% will change the character of the village. Building this number of homes will lead to flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

   East Lane and Manor Farm in West Horsley have been flooded and inpassable several times over the last few years, so further building on Green Belt in the area will result less farmland/woodland areas to for the water to soak away.

1. **LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE**

   The current local amenities of West and East Horsley, car parking, doctors surgery, primary school, station car park are full to bursting and struggle to cope with the existing demand.

   The Local Plan makes no reference to providing increased infrastructure to compensate for the extra cars, children and people.

   East Lane in particular is a country road with few road markings and gets very congested at school run times, especially where the road narrows to a single lane. Also, there are many children walking, scootering and cycling to school. To increase the number of cars in this area can only endanger children’s lives.

   Therefore I ask GBC to revise the housing number, and to amend the Local Plan to utilise brownfield/previously used land rather than green field sites – of which there are significant amounts of the former within the Borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our drainage system, our water supply, our medical facilities and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes West Horsley nor the extra homes on the Wisley airfield site.

To increase the number of houses in West Horsley by 35% will change the character of the village. Building this number of homes will lead to flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

East Lane and Manor Farm in West Horsley have been flooded and impassable several times over the last few years, so further building on Green Belt in the area will result less farmland/woodland areas to for the water to soak away.

The current local amenities of West and East Horsley, car parking, doctors surgery, primary school, station car park are full to bursting and struggle to cope with the existing demand.

The Local Plan makes no reference to providing increased infrastructure to compensate for the extra cars, children and people.

East Lane in particular is a country road with few road markings and gets very congested at school run times, especially where the road narrows to a single lane. Also, there are many children walking, scootering and cycling to school. To increase the number of cars in this area can only endanger children’s lives.

Therefore I ask GBC to revise the housing number, and to amend the Local Plan to utilise brownfield/previously used land rather than green field sites – of which there are significant amounts of the former within the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Our local schools are full to capacity as it is, our dentists, doctors and of course the R.S.C.H is breaking under the strain. Our local amenities will not be able to cope with the large increase of population and traffic.

If the proposed increase of houses goes ahead we all loose the quality of life that so far the village of Horsley give us.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2036  
**Respondent:** 15261473 / Alan Bryant  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Ref: Proposed Planning For East Horsley Etc,

I am writing to place on record my objections to the above proposals as detailed below:-

1. **TRAFFIC AND PARKING**

The level of traffic on Ockham Road South/North is already excessive, particularly with heavy vehicles who use it as a short cut to the A3 and the M25. Parking in the centre of the village (ie Station Parade) is already at full capacity and there is no space for building further shops.

2. **SCHOOLS AND MEDICAL FACILITIES**

These are both under full strain and would be unable to stand up to a large influx of houses (over 500 and 2,068 on Wisley airfield)

3. **GENERAL COMMENT**

In common with all others in this village we strongly object to the loss of Green Belt status. We came East Horsley in 1971 as shopkeepers and would be against any plans which would change the character of one of Surrey's best villages. Surely there must be other Green Belt areas in Surrey which would be more suited to the plans proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

9.I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

10.1 OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2084 Respondent: 15263905 / Philip Walker Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9.1 OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

10.1 OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

10.I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
infrastructure plans are being used to justify taking rural areas out of the Green Belt for developments which could well prove to be unsustainable. This is unacceptable: sustainability should be proven first, with an appropriate timetable.

FRR5: Please see my comments on Policy P4.

SED3: I object to the proposal for a secondary school near Wanborough Station. Please see my comments objecting to Site A46.

Additional: Due to the volume and speed of traffic on the A31, there is already a need to provide safe crossings where footpaths and bridle ways theoretically connect the north and south slopes. The communities of Normandy, Wanborough, Puttenham, Seale, Compton and Wood Street Village used to be well connected, but the north / south links are now almost unusable. If site A26 does go ahead, we will lose a huge amount of countryside on which many of us walk, cycle and ride every day. The developers should be required to provide significant funding for safe access to the southern slopes of the Hogs Back to partially mitigate our loss, with some local government and highways funding also being made available to make our rights of way viable again and to reconnect communities rent asunder by traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1057  Respondent: 15264065 / Roshan Bailey  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I welcome the clearer wording regarding timing, phasing and application of planning conditions and obligations. It is imperative that no developments should be approved without clear, acceptable and funded plans in place to provide adequate and effective infrastructure of all types and that even where approval has been given, development must follow provision of infrastructure and not proceed without such infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2122  Respondent: 15264225 / Mel McVickers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3) I object on the basis that the congestion that will result on already overcrowded overused roads in the area will bring the area to a standstill and increase the risk of serious accidents. Policy I1

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2124  Respondent: 15264225 / Mel McVickers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5) I object to the development of the Garlick Arch site as there is no provision for an increase in relation to Doctors Surgeries, the existing village surgery is under constant strain already. Policy P2

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18623  Respondent: 15264225 / Mel McVickers  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

8) I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for the sites, I am alarmed that these plans have been put forward when there appears to be no inclusion of how the infrastructure would be required would be developed. There is a huge lack of incompetence of behalf of the planning authority. Policy I1.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2128  Respondent: 15264449 / Elaine McVickers  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3) I object on the basis that the congestion that will result on already overcrowded overused roads in the area will bring the area to a standstill and increase the risk of serious accidents. Policy I1

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14923  Respondent: 15265377 / Emma Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2141</th>
<th>Respondent: 15266305 / A Andrews</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also where are the services such as Doctors Surgeries, Hospitals, Schools at all levels, Community Centres, etc. Existing services in this area are full to capacity

Also is building on school playing fields is not a good idea as there is a national problem with childhood obesity.

Therefore I object to the Guildford Borough Council's draft local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2162</th>
<th>Respondent: 15268641 / Sandy Homewood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to essential facilities – NO MENTION IN WRITTEN POLICIES.

Vague statements within Infrastructure Polices section.

The small grocery store at the southern end of the village may close later this year as the shop owner is retiring. There are no plans to keep this in place and will go the way of the Post Office we lost from there next door recently.

Even if commercial outlets such as these would remain, there has always been very limited parking outside this store and such congestion as there has been in the past would get far worse.

People using East Horsley’s shops and Public Library in 2016 experience more and more difficulty in parking their cars at most times of the day. The proposed large increase in population of West and East Horsley will make parking and movement into and through the village considerably more difficult and time consuming.

Schools – the word ‘schools’ is mentioned in Definitions under Policy 11 Infrastructure and Delivery.

There is a continuing lack of state primary school places in the village. The Raleigh school which serves both East and West Horsley is full every year and this has been the situation for many years. Secondary school places are limited in number at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools involve a much longer journey of time and distance from the village to reach them. This alone is not environmentally acceptable, especially in the current climate where we are encouraged to be more “green”.
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Glenesk and Cranmore private schools are well supported by many families living in Guildford and other villages up to 14 miles away. Each of these private schools during term time, receives high volumes of traffic going to and from each school at each end of the school day, on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively.

Medical facilities – possible extension to Kingston Avenue Medical Centre mentioned in Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)

Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, serving all of East and West Horsley and areas beyond, is always extremely busy and residents experience difficulty in making appointments. The planned population increase (in excess of Government ONS forecasts) for the Borough will require a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to cope.

Roads and Transport Infrastructure – these words are mentioned in Definitions under Policy I1 Infrastructure and Delivery.

No detail for West Horsley has been found in any of the Local Plan documents, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Whilst Horsley station has frequent trains to London and Guildford 7 days a week, the station car park is normally full on weekdays. An increase in village population will increase pressure on station parking and traffic movements to / from Horsley station to drop off/ collect travellers to London and school children going to Guildford and Leatherhead.

Traffic generation from the proposed new housing estates will be considerable. Most households in rural areas as a necessity have 2 cars, many having 3. Journey times on local roads will increase significantly.

Finally:

Waste water Infrastructure – these words receive a mention in Reasoned Justification under Policy I1.

No detail for West Horsley has been found in any of the Local Plan documents, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

There are known sewage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North / Green Lane area. Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments.

The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley, will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advise a 2 to 3 years lead-in period to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.

It is blatantly obvious that the proposed development on the scale suggested is unreasonable, impractical and unacceptable to all that will be affected – directly through the villages and further afield

I ask that the appropriate and responsible authorities seek all opportunities to developing brown field sites – through the Guildford Borough Council area, before even considering such drastic and environmentally damaging options which seem to have been ill-thought out.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2290  Respondent: 15270401 / Lynne and Nick Martin  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
4. Flood Risk & Congestion

Our drains, our water supply, our medical facilities, state primary school, and our roads cannot cope with the proposed number of new homes. Building this number of homes will lead to flood risk here and downstream (along the Wey and Thames). The planned development on Green Belt is therefore unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

We object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery. Most of the borough’s infrastructure is straining to accommodate current needs and organic growth, yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that massively under-funded or an implosion as transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services become simultaneously overloaded. The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value. The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem. The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself.

Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceeding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable. The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints. The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model. Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods. Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan. The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11,
are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some 
interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays 
and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an 
derstanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to 
capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will 
be worse than it is today on much of the network. It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the 
potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level 
of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for 
park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below. In order to gain an insight into 
conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows 
that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those 
in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will 
not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be 
increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario 5...indicates that at the 
strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton. The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”. Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided. The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR: Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road / Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSC through the development (para 4.7.3) (see annex 4) Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8), Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14) Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction. Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction). Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane. Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The
network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Independent Traffic report annex 3.pdf (2.5 MB)
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I do not think that the infrastructure development proposals are sufficiently robust to support the plan. To say that the development will not go ahead until infrastructure is in place is unenforceable and unaccountable. I just don't believe or trust this assertion. You only need to consider the unresolved issues such as another river crossing, a central and integrated bus facility. GRA's comments all apply here in my view absence of a clear and workable plan for an integrated bus interchange and incorporating plans for the demand and capacity of rail services are tow good examples. The plan also needs to provide more convincing data and assumptions on town centre traffic, buses and parking. The nature of Guildford's geography contained by the river and the railway means that the road system is particularly susceptible to congestion.

I fundamentally disagree with a plan that seeks to expand the size of the town by a quarter and therefore register my objection to it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2329  Respondent: 15278209 / M Field  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 Draft a local Plan for the following reasons.

Who are these ridiculous people who make these decisions. Are they lacking in common sense.

Guildford town centre and the existing traffics routes are vastly over subscribed. These new measures would make it impossible to shop there.

The rd structure through Burpham is a narrow rd of one lane in either direction.

The local hospital is also oversubscribed already without adding more capacity.

School and local GP services are inadequate already.

Development of this capacity in such a small area would bring unsatisfactory living standards to the area, as people live on top of one another, possibly generating a raised crime rate.

Sly fields depot is under pressure dealing with the refuse generated now. How much more refuse will be generated by all these extra dwelling.

Where will the people living in these homes find employment. The area isn't suitable for industry and further business buildings who will be able to afford to rent them.

Industry being at an all time low in this country anyway.

We already have a railway site at merrow pk which has been closed for years when opening it would benefit the existing population when merrow pk est Wyelea farm and bowyer farms estates were built. It was t feasible because of the lack of infrastructure To deal with it then. So why add to it know.

The existing park and ride is undersubscribed already so why add another site.
With existing population increased by the university why would we need 2000 thousand homes with it inmates swelling it even further.

Finally we would have to take turns to shop in Guildford and use the roads on rota basis. How much unused business capacity is there already in Guildford.

The sports centre is also oversubscribed where would all the extra children go.

How many children would this exercise add to the area existing and to be born.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2333  **Respondent:** 15278337 / Alastair Rutherford-Warren  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Infrastructure, Policies I1, I2 and I3

As residents of the village of East Horsley, we are all only too aware of the deficiencies and dangers summarised by East Horsley Parish Council in its specific comments on these Policies. Whilst most would, very reluctantly, accept the status quo, a deteriorating picture would meet with very strong objections and opposition. Given the housing plans, a significant deterioration is would be inevitable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17643  **Respondent:** 15278369 / Ripley Parish Council (Jim Morris)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Infrastructure problems are not limited to highways. New homes need schools, health, and other services which are not available in the local area. If these facilities are provided in the rural area, the intensification of activity will contribute to urbanisation of the rural area.

33. The full consequences of this approach is likely to include:

- Erosion of the Green Belt, harm to the landscape and historic character of some of the most attractive historic villages
- Large numbers of houses in places poorly serviced by public transport and local services, employment and retail facilities; resulting in
- Substantial increases in car borne commuting; resulting in
- Increased pressure on the existing unsuitable highway network, particularly the smaller unsuitable rural roads which will serve new or expanded settlements in the countryside north of Guildford, including Ripley, Send and Clandon, Ockham and East/West Horsleys
• Inappropriate highway works to increase junction capacities or to provide improved visibility splays; resulting in
• Loss of rural character and
• The creation of larger isolated communities with few services and harm to community cohesion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18678  Respondent: 15278465 / Chris Wright  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2335  **Respondent:** 15278529 / Ken Tough  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan. With around 6000 of the proposed 14,000 new homes to be built within a few miles of the Burpham area, I find this a disproportionate level of development in one part of the Borough. Furthermore, much of this is on the green belt, there is no apparent provision for appropriate improvements to either the A3 or local roads, and there is a distinct lack of details of essential infrastructure required to support such developments.

It is deeply concerning that developments on such a scale are being proposed without specific infrastructure details or indeed the evidence for such housing requirements in the Borough.

I sincerely hope that you will reconsider the Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2522  **Respondent:** 15280737 / Miller Developments (David Milloy)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )**

The plan notes at paragraph 4.6.1 that infrastructure provision and upgrading has not always kept pace with population growth, employment and transport demands and that in parts of the Borough some infrastructure is currently at or near to capacity, or of poor quality.

Miller is of the opinion that this is particularly true of the radial routes in to Guildford that will be the principal transport...
corridors between the strategic allocations and the county town. With the exception of Wisley Airfield, whilst the
strategic highway network, notably the A3, provides the main link more distant employment centres, if the sustainable
transport objectives of the Council are to be achieved it is the local network that must have the capacity to accommodate
the level of housing growth proposed.

Of particular concern are the links between Gosden Hill Farm and Guildford town centre and the link between Blackwell
Farm and the town centre. Miller is of the opinion that the Council has not adequately demonstrated that these routes have
the capacity to accommodate the anticipated levels of traffic that will be generated by these developments at the peak
period on the highway network. Furthermore, Miller questions whether the proposed Sustainable Transport Corridors
envisaged are deliverable within either a reasonable timescale or at a cost that can be funded by the developments they
primarily serve. When contributions to the cost of improvements to the strategic highway network and rail services are
fully taken into account the viability of these schemes could well be threatened or their delivery significantly delayed.

In relation to Blackwell Farm, the Council and Highways England are yet to identify how the physical improvements
linking to the A3 and A31 can be physically provided and in the absence of this link Miller does not see how the existing
network of roads (which serve the Science Park, Sport Park, university campus, County Hospital and the Tesco foodstore
could be used as a ‘secondary’ through route from the A31. This part of the highway network is clearly at, or already
exceeding, its design capacity at peak times as is evidenced by the queuing back of traffic through Park Barn and the
Tesco roundabout / A3 junction at peak periods; these being parts of the network that should be clearly kept free flowing
for emergency vehicles.

Whilst Policy I1 indicates that infrastructure needed to support development, to be secured through planning obligations
and other funding, ‘should be provided and available when first needed to serve the occupants and users of the
development’, Miller is concerned about the reference to the word ‘should’; especially when the policy goes onto state
that ‘where necessary supporting infrastructure is not secured, development may be phased to reflect infrastructure
delivery, or will be refused’.

It is considered that this caveat is not surprising in circumstances where the proposed infrastructure improvements have
not been agreed between the relevant authorities and have certainly not been costed accurately. Miller therefore maintains
that there is no certainty that the strategic allocations can be delivered in a timely manner and that it is extremely possible
that housing delivery could be postponed beyond the end of the plan period.

We note also that despite the Plan relying on rail improvements and the provision of two new stations there appears to be
no funding committed to deliver these improvements. The recently published Invitation To Tender (ITT) for the next
South Western Rail Franchise (due to commence in 2017 for a period of at least ten years) makes no provision or
reference to the next franchisee being required to make or enable such improvements, and on this basis it is difficult to
see how such aspirations will come to fruition.

Finally, Policy I1 confirms that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be used to secure additional financial
contributions from developers and that such money will be supplemented by diverting 25% of the CIL receipts
originating from each Parish and from Guildford. It is not clear if this additional income for ‘highway’ improvements will
be sufficient in the event of a shortfall from developer contributions and a shortfall in other funding streams.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17343  Respondent: 15280737 / Miller Developments (David Milloy)  Agent: The Chine
Consultancy Advice Ltd (David Pugh)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally
Compliant? ( No )
The plan notes at paragraph 4.6.1 that infrastructure provision and upgrading has not always kept pace with population growth, employment and transport demands and that in parts of the Borough some infrastructure is currently at or near to capacity, or of poor quality.

Miller is of the opinion that this is particularly true of the radial routes in to Guildford that will be the principal transport corridors between the strategic allocations and the county town. With the exception of Wisley Airfield, whilst the strategic highway network, notably the A3, provides the main link more distant employment centres, if the sustainable transport objectives of the Council are to be achieved it is the local network that must have the capacity to accommodate the level of housing growth proposed.

Of particular concern are the links between Gosden Hill Farm and Guildford town centre and the link between Blackwell Farm and the town centre. Miller is of the opinion that the Council has not adequately demonstrated that these routes have the capacity to accommodate the anticipated levels of traffic that will be generated by these developments at the peak period on the highway network. Furthermore, Miller questions whether the proposed Sustainable Transport Corridors envisaged are deliverable within either a reasonable timescale or at a cost that can be funded by the developments they primarily serve. When contributions to the cost of improvements to the strategic highway network and rail services are fully taken into account the viability of these schemes could well be threatened or their delivery significantly delayed.

In relation to Blackwell Farm, the Council and Highways England are yet to identify how the physical improvements linking to the A3 and A31 can be physically provided and in the absence of this link Miller does not see how the existing network of roads (which serve the Science Park, Sport Park, university campus, County Hospital and the Tesco foodstore could be used as a ‘secondary’ through route from the A31. This part of the highway network is clearly at, or already exceeding, its design capacity at peak times as is evidenced by the queuing back of traffic through Park Barn and the Tesco roundabout / A3 junction at peak periods; these being parts of the network that should be clearly kept free flowing for emergency vehicles.

Whilst Policy I1 indicates that infrastructure needed to support development, to be secured through planning obligations and other funding, ‘should be provided and available when first needed to serve the occupants and users of the development’, Miller is concerned about the reference to the word ‘should’; especially when the policy goes onto state that ‘where necessary supporting infrastructure is not secured, development may be phased to reflect infrastructure delivery, or will be refused’.

It is considered that this caveat is not surprising in circumstances where the proposed infrastructure improvements have not been agreed between the relevant authorities and have certainly not been costed accurately. Miller therefore maintains that there is no certainty that the strategic allocations can be delivered in a timely manner and that it is extremely possible that housing delivery could be postponed beyond the end of the plan period.

We note also that despite the Plan relying on rail improvements and the provision of two new stations there appears to be no funding committed to deliver these improvements. The recently published Invitation To Tender (ITT) for the next South Western Rail Franchise (due to commence in 2017 for a period of at least ten years) makes no provision or reference to the next franchisee being required to make or enable such improvements, and on this basis it is difficult to see how such aspirations will come to fruition.

Finally, Policy I1 confirms that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be used to secure additional financial contributions from developers and that such money will be supplemented by diverting 25% of the CIL receipts originating from each Parish and from Guildford. It is not clear if this additional income for ‘highway’ improvements will be sufficient in the event of a shortfall from developer contributions and a shortfall in other funding streams.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY)**

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
- No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2527</th>
<th>Respondent: 15283073 / Natasha France</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object. The plan relies on outside funding to make sites acceptable. I do not believe that the plan can deliver housing and infrastructure in a timely fashion as the outside funding is not guaranteed. For example, if funding is not made available or is delayed for junction 10, the wisely, godston hill and send are simply unacceptable. Why have over half of the plans sites been allocated in the north of the borough all requiring the A3 and M25 to be improved with funding from outside and none guaranteed sources. In fact this plan can not deliver in the short to medium term. I object. Moreover, it would seem to me that the send site at Garrick arch is only included as a site to make the Wisley site acceptable in transport term:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2534</th>
<th>Respondent: 15283681 / Janet Durrant</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Green Belt is a vital part of the British way of life and I object to any loss of this important facility. The existing Sewage works is already not coping properly with the existing demand, often making the River Wey very smelly near its outlets, plus causing foul odors at Slyfield and other residential areas, including Burpham. This must be addressed before more building work is done. What about schools? Extra places must be provided in time to accommodate the many more children in the new developments. Has this been addressed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4627  **Respondent:** 15284385 / T.W. Turnill  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I refer primarily to the effect 1100 extra houses, each with a probable two cars, will have on the local traffic situation, which is already creaking. Both Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane are country roads, each having dangerous bridges associated with the railway line. These roads are on the borders of the planned development, while the northern edge is bordered by the A323, which is already extremely busy at peak times. The addition of a 1100 pupil Secondary School on that road will increase the traffic intolerably, when taken in addition to the cars from the new development trying to reach Guildford or Aldershot.

Whenever there is an accident on the Hogs Back or A3, traffic tries to exit via Wanborough Hill to use either of the two lanes, neither of which is capable or designed to take that volume of traffic. Anyone who tries to access the A31 at peak traffic times from either the Puttenham or Wanborough directions will know how long the queues are, and the potential for accidents for traffic leaving the A31 at the Puttenham turn off. This could severely jeopardise emergency traffic trying to access the new development, whose road structure might well be not capable of allowing Fire and Ambulance vehicles to attend an emergency, especially during peak traffic times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2549  **Respondent:** 15284609 / Nicola Wootten  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Further development would cause even more strain on the local infrastructure of schools, Doctors Surgerys and indeed the Royal Surrey County Hospital. If continued development occurs, soon there will be NO differentiation between this area and London.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2564  **Respondent:** 15284993 / Samantha Thompson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2565  Respondent: 15284993 / Samantha Thompson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. There are no plans to improve these services. There is also no commitment to improve / expand the Villages Medical Centre or provide additional and acceptable school places. This should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2579  Respondent: 15285121 / Audrey Boughton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. Without proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road &amp; Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ensuing increase in traffic along wholly unsuitable narrow lanes will lead to a increased likelihood of accidents with the many cyclists enjoying this area.

Huge demand will be placed on local services which are already stretched.

It will turn this part of Surrey into another anonymous urban sprawl.

With greater creativity and thought, I am sure a balance can be achieved between the needs for housing and preserving the countryside for future generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

The local infrastructure is woefully inadequate at the present time it would collapse under any the slightest increased pressure

Please take note of my views. I have been a resident in the Ripley area for all of my 50 years, and I have seen it systematically encroach and the infrastructure put under such a great strain

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
| Comment ID: PSLPP16/3650 | Respondent: 15292129 / Shirley Wilson | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 | Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I object to any of the local plan development as I don’t think that enough planning and thought has gone into what the affect will have the roads, schools, doctors, parking and the local people who already live in the local area. We would lose the green belt forever as well the increase pollution it will cause having more traffic in the local area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/2655 | Respondent: 15293793 / Anita Norman | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 | Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I object to any of the local plan development as I don’t think that enough planning and thought has gone into what the affect will have the roads, schools, doctors, parking and the local people who already live in the local area. We would lose the green belt forever as well the increase pollution it will cause having more traffic in the local area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

- **SCHOOLS** - there appears to be no provision within the Council proposals for any immediate provision for any new schools or extension to existing schools, most of which are already under extreme pressure through oversized classes and lack of funding.

- **HEALTH SERVICES** - there appears to be no provision in the Council proposals for any immediate provision for any new medical facilities such as Doctors Surgeries or extensions to existing facilities.

- **TRANSPORT** - the introduction of a proposed 14,000 homes in the Borough will put an unacceptable and unsustainable pressure on public services that are already failing the public due to cut backs and lack of investment. Many residents will prefer to use their own vehicles to go even short distances and suffer the inevitable traffic jams, rather than use a public transport system that simply does not not encourage its use.

I trust that the above points are clear and that my objection will be recorded along with the many thousands of others the Council will undoubtedly receive as a result of their unworkable and highly unpopular development plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2674  Respondent: 15295425 / Gordon Harris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As it is at present, the traffic during the 'rush hours' is almost continuous with long tailbacks at every junction, the parking in the village is becoming beyond a joke and to get a local doctor's appointment when you need one is just a matter of luck!!

I would therefore like to register my strong objection to removal of the Green Belt status of this and surrounding villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2681  Respondent: 15295809 / David Lees  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the increased traffic and congestion that development will cause to the village roads.

In Ripley, Send and Glandon, there is already far too much traffic. The proposals will cause more traffic and congestion. 5000 more houses in this area of narrow rural roads, which are not planned to be improved is dangerous as many are bad condition and have no facilities for pedestrians or cyclists

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2692  Respondent: 15295809 / David Lees  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inadequate infrastructure planning for sites.

The huge scale of development proposed is not supported by adequate infrastructure improvements, especially at Garlick's Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure proposals at all.

The local Plan does not provide for improvements of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2699</th>
<th>Respondent: 15296545 / Catherine Lees</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure. The villages of Ripley and Send already suffer from severe congestion for much of the day. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2712</td>
<td>Respondent: 15296545 / Catherine Lees</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites. The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick's Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc are at or close to capacity. There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15477</td>
<td>Respondent: 15297249 / Christine Gates</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I object to the lack of immediate provision of schools. Children are already suffering from being housed in cramped, 'temporary' classrooms that have been in situ for years. 12) I object to the lack of immediate provision of doctors surgeries which are over subscribed in this area.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13) I object to the lack of immediate provision of dental facilities which are already lacking in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2743  Respondent: 15297921 / Mark Padgett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live in Woking but reside in West Horsley each weekend as my father lives in the village, and I wish to object to the proposed plan.

The intended proposal is not appropriate as it will seriously impact on the local infrastructure of the village and the quality of life of the local residents. I strongly object to this development.

It is already extremely difficult to park at Horsley station and the shops and during the week these areas are full with cars and traffic, and any increase would make these areas impossible for local residents to use.

The current medical centre is extremely busy and it takes several weeks to get an appointment and the planned population increase would not be sustainable. The current medical provision in the village would be unable to cope with extra demand.

The waste water network is also unlikely to be able to cope with the demand created by the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2753  Respondent: 15298017 / Margaret Cousins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example The Street in West Clandon and Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and West Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from severe traffic congestion. Much of West Clandon is deemed by Guildford Borough Council to be a Conservation Area and we residents are required to abide by those rules. Is not GBC also duty bound to protect and conserve the area? Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles have, of necessity, to mount the pavement. With a primary school, two pubs and a children’s playground, quite clearly the village should be protected from, and not be forced to take yet more, traffic.

...  

10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2776</th>
<th>Respondent: 15298497 / John David Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic. This will seriously impact on residents and safety.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2781</th>
<th>Respondent: 15298497 / John David Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2799</th>
<th>Respondent: 15298849 / Elaine Burns</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES**

**POLICIES II, I2 & I3**
I object to these policies as there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

Roads across the Horsleys are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic.

The principal through roads are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. They are really lanes not roads at all.

Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains.

The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs.

There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking.

The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

The Horsleys are served by a single primary school, The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsleys.

I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I therefore object to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: pslp171/1508 | Respondent: 15298849 / Elaine Burns | Agent: |
| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1 |

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Local Plan has made no concessions to the problems of infrastructure. The narrow lanes of East and West Horsley will be unchanged and the railway station carpark cannot be increased to take more cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/14231 | Respondent: 15299201 / Samira Abdullah | Agent: |
| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1 |

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services. The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value. The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem. The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceeding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable. The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints. The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model. Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods. Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan. The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network. It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for parks and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below. In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario 5...indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton. The
cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”. Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided. The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR: Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road/Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3) Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8). Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14) Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction. Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction). Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane. Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2810  Respondent: 15299361 / Jane Finlay  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object most strongly to the traffic congestion any additional development will cause to our local villages due to inadequate road infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**POLICY I1 - Infrastructure and delivery**

We object to this policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number. The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/2833  Respondent: 15299425 / Tim and June Yorath  Agent:**

**Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision for the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The traffic on Forest Road from early morning to late evening is already so heavy that one has to wait and wait to cross to visit or shop or get to Surrey gardens. The car park at Effingham Junction station is already full each day. Motorists even parking on the common road. East Horsely station car park would not be able to cope with an influx of commuters.

Understanding that development will be required in the future, I feel that the numbers cited are beyond reality. Little thought seems to have been given to the load on old infrastructure and drainage, school populations, transport or medical services. There seems to be no understanding of existing facilities in the villages or what might be required in the future.

Hoping that more careful thought and planning will be given to the future of these areas and the concerns of the residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2867  Respondent: 15300993 / Sally Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I trust that the objections made above are fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2878  Respondent: 15301089 / Brian Yeomans  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Policy II: Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT to this policy.

- Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

- The methodology commissioned by the Council to assess traffic and the corresponding roads infrastructure needs is inadequate for the purpose of the Local Plan and identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Under the growth proposed some locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. Even the A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2887  Respondent: 15301409 / Marian Simonds  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This week it took my son in law an hour to drive from Ripley into Guildford, it took my daughter an hour to drive from Weybridge to Cobham, parents cannot get their children into local schools, it can take 2 weeks to see your GP and the Royal Surrey hospital is at breaking point. Rush hour trains from Guildford and Woking to London are amongst the most overcrowded in the United Kingdom. Is the solution to this really to build the proposed quantity of new homes?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2901  Respondent: 15301761 / Paul Norman  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- SCHOOLS - there appears to be no provision within the Council proposals for any immediate provision for any new schools or extension to existing schools, most of which are already under extreme pressure through oversized classes and lack of funding.
• **HEALTH SERVICES** - there appears to be no provision in the Council proposals for any immediate provision for any new medical facilities such as Doctors Surgeries or extensions to existing facilities.

• **TRANSPORT** the introduction of a proposed 14,000 homes in the Borough will put an unacceptable and unsustainable pressure on public services that are already failing the public due to cut backs and lack of investment. Many residents will prefer to use their own vehicles to go even short distances and suffer the inevitable traffic jams, rather than use a public transport system that simply does not not encourage its use.

I trust that the above points are clear and that my objection will be recorded along with the many thousands of others the Council will undoubtedly receive as a result of their unworkable and highly unpopular development plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2903  **Respondent:** 15302081 / C.A. Sayers  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2912  **Respondent:** 15303649 / Maureen Wilkins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the amount of traffic that these developments will bring to our area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2922  **Respondent:** 15303905 / E Greenhalgh  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This road is dangerous in particularly when trying to access it from the station, a side road or a property.

At its narrowest Ifor one have been forced to mount the pavement to avoid collision from oncoming trucks none of which should be using a road like this.
There have been several accidents due to excessive speed. Some while ago speeds of up to 60mph by cars were recorded. Nothing has been done to sort out this problem. Any development which added more vehicles to the road would only make the problem worse.

I appreciate that the responsibility for the state of the roads is not your problem but the junction at the traffic lights where the A246 meets the A247 is a national disgrace. Perhaps you should spend more time pressing for this junction to be repaired properly rather than bodged.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2927  **Respondent:** 15304065 / Andrea Mills  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Coordinate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I strongly object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for a new hospital. The Royal Surrey hospital already serves a vast length of the A3 road as the next hospital going south is Portsmouth. The Royal Surrey hospital and other major hospitals situated in the county of Surrey are already stretched to the ultimate limits.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for new roads to link local and neighbouring towns. The existing roads are already grid locked not only at peak times but now throughout the day with the slightest incident that brings chaos to the local roads.

Junction 10 of the M25 the main hub for Heathrow and Gatwick airports is now regularly at a standstill throughout the day. The proposed 2016 Draft Local Plan would result in many thousands more vehicles (ie cars and commercial vehicles) attempting to get on the M25 at junction 10 and also using the local roads that link towns.

I strongly object to the lack of any immediate provision for new transport links. With grid locked roads new railway tracks will have to be laid. The London underground system will now need to expand into the Guildford Borough especially with a link to the airports also local towns and neighbouring borough towns as all of the current road structure will become impossible to use.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9145  **Respondent:** 15304705 / Patricia Aberdeen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Coordinate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as below:
Roads the traffic is already terrible here in the morning to the A3 and from 4pm to 7pm constant queues both to the A3 and from it through Burpham and as each house may have two cars chaos will ensue.

It’s no good having 2000 new homes (hopefully affordable not £800,000 to £1,000,000) until you have built schools first. There are no school places in Guildford, also need other infrastructure such as shops, church, parks etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2940  Respondent: 15304737 / Pamela Orthodoux  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6). Increase in Traffic.

The inevitable increase in traffic as a result of more housing in this area will create more pollution in the form of exhaust gases and noise which will have an unhealthy effect on residents.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that that Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2949  Respondent: 15304897 / Richard Baker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2950  Respondent: 15304897 / Richard Baker  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2994  Respondent: 15304929 / Rosemary Wood  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure.

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the K2.47 through West Glandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Glandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Glandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough's infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan's determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic.

It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)**

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic. Every time there is an accident on the A3 or the M25 the local roads become gridlocked. In the morning and evening the traffic queues through Ripley, along the A3 and onto the M25, more housing with thousands more cars will make the roads impassable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3016  **Respondent:** 15312769 / Norah Johnson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)**

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43), which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3022  **Respondent:** 15312961 / Alison Johnson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)**

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic. Every time there is an accident on the A3 or the M25 the local roads become gridlocked. In the
morning and evening the traffic queues through Ripley, along the A3 and onto the M25, more housing with thousands more cars will make the roads impassable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3031  **Respondent:** 15312961 / Alison Johnson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43), which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3037  **Respondent:** 15313921 / Nicky, Chris and Thomas Wilson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. The development at gossden farm, Talbot and wisely airfield and the disproportionate number of development to one part of the borough.

Brown field sites need to be developed in Guildford where there is a infrastructure of stations, schools and hospitals to absorb a increase in population.

The local plan was a consultation and has not been listened too, the is far much weight being given to developers wanting to make money.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3044  **Respondent:** 15314305 / Andrew Dennis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3052  Respondent: 15314305 / Andrew Dennis  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3074  Respondent: 15314881 / Gill Haig-Brown  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5) I object to the plan having no planned infrastructure re roads, travel, hospitals and schools etc

I REQUEST THAT GBC IN THE LIGHT OF THE UK LEAVING THE EU, RE-ANALYSIS THE NEED FOR NEW HOUSING IN THIS AREA WITH TRANSPARENCY AND HARD STATISTICS.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3077  Respondent: 15315009 / Edward Dennis  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

1. **I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)**

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3517  Respondent: 15321217 / Sally Rule  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3134  Respondent: 15322241 / K. Paulson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The air pollution levels are already unacceptable and I would be annoyed if the GBC should legally sanction new houses being built, let alone a school putting further strain on pollution levels and the physical safety of the occupants.

This area is near the most built up traffic hot spot area in the county. Junction 10 of the M25 is a traffic black spot which has a clear adverse affect on important routes into the city and to two major airports.

The local roads cannot cope safely with the increase if traffic there is no room for lorries cars and cyclists as it is. There have been numerous accidents recently on local roads and the GBC will be sanctioning the dangerous road usage that will lead to deaths of road users.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3159  Respondent: 15323041 / Jane Doherty  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
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These three policies cover Infrastructure & Delivery. Whilst we support the general policy statements as presented, it is the detailed infrastructure proposals for Guildford Borough which give me cause for concern.

I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many pothole Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;

- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally As a senior sec councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: "East Horsley has lanes, not roads." East Horsley's 'lanes' are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV's now using them;

- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;

- The pavements are in poor As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;

- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Darking or Woking; and

- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of

Furthermore, I would observe that the traffic at the A3/M25 Interchange (Junction 10 of the M25) is already at a point where significant delays and congestion occur every morning. My personal experience is that this congestion has worsened significantly over the past few years. Whilst the plan references improvement to this junction, these may ease the current issues, but adding the housing proposed for the Horsleys, Wisley Airfield, Ripley and Send will likely result in no improvement, but rather worsening of an already unacceptable situation.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in
part, come from developer contribution. However, it is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 - 15 of the plan.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools.

Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 - 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, EHPC believes that this needs to be done earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley's.

I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I accordingly OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I further OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

POLICY 14 Green and blue infrastructure Isupport this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
13. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3266</th>
<th>Respondent: 15326401 / Claire Haslam</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3254</th>
<th>Respondent: 15326465 / James Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon. There is too much congestion already!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. The number of houses proposed will mean dangerous and unsustainable traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3261</th>
<th>Respondent: 15326465 / James Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3267  Respondent: 15326785 / James Hampton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3271  Respondent: 15326785 / James Hampton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10879  Respondent: 15326817 / Peter Jennings-Giles  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3272  Respondent: 15326945 / Alex Boden  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing to register my feedback on the Guildford Local Plan. I support the Guildford Residents Association (GRA) response and oppose Guildford expanding by a quarter.

Whilst I accept that there is a need in the UK to build more housing, I feel that the proposals outlined in the Local Plan for Guildford are excessively large - simply put, the volume of building outlined is too large for the town's infrastructure.

The infrastructure in Guildford is not ready to support such a large-scale development - before adding even one quarter of the number of properties proposed in the Plan Guildford needs:

- vastly increased capacity on the trains to London for everyone who has to commute to London to work (there are not enough jobs in Guildford to support the current population, let alone a massively expanded one);

- a remedy to the issues caused by the A3 (splitting the town in half, with commensurate social effects, causing gridlock in the town at rush hour and whenever there is frequently an accident);

- increased crossing points over the river, railway and A3 to make transport easier and unite the town (ideally the A3 and the railway should run below ground);

- integrated rail and bus services - there is currently not one single bus running from the mainline station, the main entry point for visitors and commuters;

- bus passes which enable local residents to use buses cost effectively, and encourage people not to drive into the centre of Guildford;

- proper cycle lanes to and from the station and other key destinations to encourage people out of the cars and reduce the volume of traffic on the roads.

I see no progress on any of these items - they should be the number one priority of the council. **Any approval of new housing schemes should be dependent on these issues being addressed. No properly thought through infrastructure - no houses!** The proposed infrastructure additions in the plan - adding stations at Park Barn and Merrow - will exacerbate the problems experienced by the rest of the existing infrastructure.

And I have not mentioned the issues around unjustified Green Belt development - squandering our greenfield sites in a single Plan, robbing future generations and destroying one of the main things that makes Guildford unique and attracts people to live here in the first place.

I expect our councillors to defend Guildford against these plans and to fight for improvements which will benefit existing and future residents, and make our town a UK leader, not a concrete backwater.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6671</th>
<th>Respondent: 15327745 / T S Pilkington and C A Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to essential facilities, such as road and transport infrastructure, parking, medical facilities, schools, waste water infrastructure, sewage infrastructure would be greatly impacted if development of the size currently proposed is granted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3300</th>
<th>Respondent: 15327809 / Nick and Lucy Griffths</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roads in Surrey are already gridlocked with traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The schools in Guildford are close to bursting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hospital will have to service yet more patients when it is already struggling to cope with the patients they currently have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors surgeries are already over stretched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local resources can barely cope with the current population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3302</th>
<th>Respondent: 15327873 / Susan Richards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY I1 - Infrastructure and delivery

I OBJECT. Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3324  Respondent: 15328161 / Louise Midgley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.
I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3334</th>
<th>Respondent: 15328481 / Millie Midgley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3350</th>
<th>Respondent: 15328865 / R.A. Love</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3353</th>
<th>Respondent: 15328993 / B. Joseph</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3358  Respondent: 15329409 / Emma Wicks  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3361  Respondent: 15329441 / Suzie Powell-Cullingford  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the lack of infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1) specifically for site A43 Garlick's Arch, which is allocated as a strategic site. There is no provision for improvements to the basic utilities such as power and sewerage and indeed the Garlick's Arch site has 3 electricity pylons directly running through the entire site. The local health service provided by The Villages Medical Centre in Send is already at capacity and serves the combined local communities of Ripley and Send. There is no provision to address this key issue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7807  Respondent: 15329441 / Suzie Powell-Cullingford  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1) specifically for site A43 Garlick’s Arch, which is allocated as a strategic site. There is no provision for improvements to the basic utilities such as power and sewerage and indeed the Garlick’s Arch site has 3 electricity pylons directly running through the entire site. The local health service provided by The Villages medical Centre in Send is already at capacity and serves the combined local communities of Ripley and Send. There is no provision to address this key issue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3373</th>
<th>Respondent: 15329537 / J Sweby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the number of vehicles on our already congested roads. Between 7.45-8.30 am and 5-6 pm the routes from burnt common to Guildford are gridlocked from the Burpham slip road to Guildford and from the roundabout at Clandon Park Gates through Merrow. Another 5,000 vehicles on this 5 mile stretch will make the journey unbearable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3378</th>
<th>Respondent: 15329537 / J Sweby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to school children having to spend 30-45 mins in a traffic jam before arriving at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to more houses in Send because of the lack of infrastructure. There are already local children who cannot get places in the village schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the stress this extra housing would put on our excellent villages medical centre. It is already a lottery as to whether an appointment can be made when needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3372</th>
<th>Respondent: 15329569 / P.J Kirkwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3385</th>
<th>Respondent: 15329825 / Sylvia Lodger</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3422  Respondent: 15331681 / Anne Lowndes  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3443  Respondent: 15340929 / Claire Smylie  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3569   Respondent: 15341889 / Allen Williams   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Doctors Surgeries, Schools and Transport are already struggling and when the cyclists are using the roads one might as well stay in doors.

My wife and family moved here 40 years ago to get relief from an area (Laleham) where similar problems were starting to show. Look at it now. It has completely lost it village status and has become attached to Staines which is pure suburbia. Do you know this area?

I suggest you and your colleagues reconsider the proposed development before it gets out of hand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3586</th>
<th>Respondent: 15342113 / Jane Carwardine</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. No infrastructure planned.

With an estimated increase of 35% of households we do not have the school places, medical facilities or drainage in place or in the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3610</th>
<th>Respondent: 15342401 / M.J. Harris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass...
through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3613 Respondent: 15342401 / M.J. Harris Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital. Where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
As residents of East Horsley we know how difficult it is to get an appointment at the Medical Centre without a few days wait and even longer if wanting to see a specific doctor. With the current shortage of general practitioners how guaranteed is it that additional doctors will be found to staff the medical centre? We both have to travel to London currently for medical reasons and know how difficult it is to get a parking space after 10.30am. How will the car park cope with the extra commuter cars from the proposed developments? How do you plan to enlarge Horsley Station car park? We do not have the problem of worrying about local schools but one of our sons has that problem and has no option but to send his children to private school because of the over-subscribing of places.

The roads around the area are in an appalling state numerous pot holes. Drainage is poor in many places. A couple of years back we had such flooded roads that it was impossible to get to Cobham whichever route was taken due to flooding. Wear and tear on the road will increase and certainly with huge haulage vehicles backwards and forwards in the development stages residents lives can only get worse and accidents will occur. The narrow roads in the area are already congested and the large number of cyclists together with haulage vehicles should be a cause for concern.

Station parade has been designated a "District Centre" - when did this come about and what does it mean for future development?

The development of 2,000 houses at Ockham (Wisley Airfield) would have an enormous impact on the facilities available in Schools, medical centre, parking all will be affected. The total number of houses which GBC proposes to be allowed in their plan is far greater than those that should be needed according to official national estimates for population growth in the Borough. How did GBC arrive at a figure that is 70% higher than the official national estimate?

Overall the proposed plan is over-ambitious and badly thought through and does not take into account the unique area in which we live. We accept that more houses need to be built to cater for the demand but a very large housing estate will only badly affect the environment and facilities of which there are problems already with the current number of residents. The planners need to rethink this before they destroy this lovely area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
As residents of East Horsley we know how difficult it is to get an appointment at the Medical Centre without a few days wait and even longer if wanting to see a specific doctor. With the current shortage of general practitioners how guaranteed is it that additional doctors will be found to staff the medical centre? We both have to travel to London currently for medical reasons and know how difficult it is to get a parking space after 10.30am. How will the car park cope with the extra commuter cars from the proposed developments? How do you plan to enlarge Horsley Station car park? We do not have the problem of worrying about local schools but one of our sons has that problem and has no option but to send his children to private school because of the over-subscribing of places.

- The roads around the area are in an appalling state numerous pot holes. Drainage is poor in many places. A couple of years back we had such flooded roads that it was impossible to get to Cobham whichever route was taken due to flooding. Wear and tear on the road will increase and certainly with huge haulage vehicles backwards and forwards in the development stages residents lives can only get worse and accidents will occur. The narrow roads in the area are already congested and the large number of cyclists together with haulage vehicles should be a cause for concern.

- Station parade has been designated a "District Centre" - when did this come about and what does it mean for future development?

- The development of 2,000 houses at Ockham (Wisley Airfield) would have an enormous impact on the facilities available in Schools, medical centre, parking all will be affected. The total number of houses which GBC proposes to be allowed in their plan is far greater than those that should be needed according to official national estimates for population growth in the Borough. How did GBC arrive at a figure that is 70% higher than the official national estimate?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Increasing the population of the local area by up 35% would require more schools, medical centres and drainage to name a few. Nothing about these developments have been mentioned in the plans. The schools are already full and the medical facilities are stretched with the current population.

To summarise my objections, I have serious worries for the following with the proposed building plans:

- Detrimental effects on already full public transportation, roads, and local car parks
- Detrimental effects on wildlife
- Detrimental effects on the village community

Air pollution becoming worse in the local area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3657  Respondent: 15344065 / Ian Hills  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Apparently the villages around Guildford are to be removed from green belt status allowing for the possibility of new housing to be built around them. Apart from the desecration of the beautiful countryside that Surrey is famous for, the road system around here of narrow lanes (incidently still full of potholes) simply cannot cope with the increase in traffic that further large scale development will bring. Developers are allowed to build, take their large profits and leave the Council to sort out the resulting infrastructure mess - which the Council never does.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3686  Respondent: 15345025 / John Weaver  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Raleigh school is the only state primary school that serves both East and West Horsley and it is full and over subscribed every year. So, where are the increasing number of young children going to attend school or do you expect the school to absorb the extra pupils in much larger class sizes or portacabins?

I serve on the committee of the Kingston Avenue Medical Centre Patient Participation Group which is the only NHS GP surgery that serves both villages. It is currently working above capacity, is finding it difficult to recruit and retain Doctors, and could not absorb the population increase from the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3709  Respondent: 15345249 / Mark Lewis  Agent:
In my opinion the plan does not have any regard for the current infrastructure within the area, which cannot cope with the current traffic conditions and the requirements of the current population, with the current facilities over stretched from schools to the local doctors surgeries. It is a plan that will profit a number of developers who have no regard for the area or the local population and this is wrong and immoral.

I would therefore like this email to be logged as an objection to the proposed plan and await the acknowledgement for my records.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

**What changes (2016)/ further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3750</th>
<th>Respondent: 15345281 / Alexandra Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?
Schools: Local schools are already at capacity – where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not be planned until many years into the project.

Medical facilities: Similar situation to the schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I have just received notice of a proposed development of 154 houses by Copperwood Developments on land adjacent to Ash train station. Recently I received notice of a proposed development of 115 houses by Persimmon on land off Foreman Road. These are in addition to 450 houses currently being built behind Ash Manor School off Manor Road.

If these proposals are passed that will be an extra 729 houses in Ash. That means over 2000 extra people including 700 to 800 children not to mention over 1500 extra cars!!

1. Where will the people go for their health care? It already takes over a week to get a routine appointment at Ash Vale Health Centre.
2. Where will all the extra children go to school? Several schools in Ash have been closed over the past years and the land sold, ironically, for housing!!
3. Where will all the extra cars go? Ash is already very busy with traffic, especially at commuter times. With an extra 1500 cars we can expect gridlock!! Car parking at the shopping areas in Ash is also beyond its capability. Further cars will make daytime parking in the village intolerable.

Additionally the two areas proposed are both to the south of the A325 Ash to Guildford Road which has been a natural southern boundary of the village and designated as land bordering the Green Belt. Where will development stop – when it reaches the Hogs Back road??

All this in addition to a proposed development of 1100 house a mile away in Normandy. I sincerely hope that all three proposed developments are turned down otherwise this currently rural area will become yet another urban jungle with an infrastructure that cannot cope.

These three new proposals for Ash & Normandy are ludicrous and must be rejected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I have just received notice of a proposed development of 154 houses by Copperwood Developments on land adjacent to Ash train station. Recently I received notice of a proposed development of 115 houses by Persimmon on land off Foreman Road. These are in addition to 450 houses currently being built behind Ash Manor School off Manor Road.

If these proposals are passed that will be an extra 729 houses in Ash. That means over 2000 extra people including 700 to 800 children not to mention over 1500 extra cars!!

1. Where will the people go for their health care? It already takes over a week to get a routine appointment at Ash Vale Health Centre.
2. Where will all the extra children go to school? Several schools in Ash have been closed over the past years and the land sold, ironically, for housing!!
3. Where will all the extra cars go? Ash is already very busy with traffic, especially at commuter times. With an extra 1500 cars we can expect gridlock!! Car parking at the shopping areas in Ash is also beyond its capability. Further cars will make daytime parking in the village intolerable.

Additionally the two areas proposed are both to the south of the A325 Ash to Guildford Road which has been a natural southern boundary of the village and designated as land bordering the Green Belt. Where will development stop – when it reaches the Hogs Back road??

All this in addition to a proposed development of 1100 house a mile away in Normandy. I sincerely hope that all three proposed developments are turned down otherwise this currently rural area will become yet another urban jungle with an infrastructure that cannot cope.

These three new proposals for Ash & Normandy are ludicrous and must be rejected.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

---

4. The plumbing and drainage systems cannot cope with heavy rainfall now. Water bubbles up and road flooding is rampant.

   1. The Doctor’s surgery in east Horsley is over-stretched currently and patients have to wait weeks for an appointment. Even the emergency sessions are forced to limit the number of patients they can deal with.

6. The school is always full and there is no room for an extension to the building.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I may be naive but I am not being disrespectful but I have always understood, and voted accordingly, that the local councillors are there to protect the interests of the ratepayers and if the answer is that this is a Government instruction, surely no Government Minister intends that a council should destroy an entire village to meet a doubtful planning target.

2. On the same theme, this plan will encourage more pollution in this area due to the massive influx of cars. The Government is supposed to be reducing pollution to protect public health.

10. The public is constantly inundated with the needs of OTHER people but what is happening to the needs of the West Horsley population? Do they deserve to have their whole standard of life as they know it destroyed and that of their families.

All these objections also apply to East Horsley and any possible development at the Wisley airport site. The majority of people in this area commute to London. More trains can possibly be laid on but where will the commuters’ cars park? Not in the railway station car parks. They are already full to capacity.

Finally if the plan goes ahead the developers will come, build their houses, walk away with enormous profits and the villagers will have to pick up the pieces.

Please reconsider this plan for all our sakes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I wish to OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the above plan as it effects the Green Belt villages of East and particularly West Horsley. The proposal that would increase the size of West Horsley by something like a third – adding 385 dwellings – provides more problems than it offers solutions and poses a host of unanswered questions such as:

O The green belt can only be built on in exceptional circumstances and – regardless of the insetting smokescreen – what are the the exceptional circumstances for Guildford Borough Council’s decision to abandon the Belt and change the character of West Horsley for ever? Especially as there are exceptional reasons why the scale of the envisaged changes is completely and utterly unsupportable. Vital infrastructure such as medical services, education and retail outlets are already mostly unavailable for the current rate-paying population of the village. The residents have to share with neighbouring East Horsley for the still inadequate facilities provided there.

O A basic environmental requirement is adequate drainage. Thames water have advised in no uncertain terms that the current wastewater network for West Horsley is unlikely to support the anticipated demand from the number of planned extra dwellings. What is GBC proposing to do about it?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3788  Respondent: 15348033 / Peter Nicholas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time; particularly at weekends, hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments, there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk of injury to the public. In the case of West Clandon, the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1).

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity...
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further.

There is no provision for increased capacity of Guildford hospital.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
On infrastructure, the revised plan proposals do not address the additional strain on despite the overwhelming objections on subject in response to the previous consultation.

In particular the wording of Policy ID1 has been amended to give the impression that provision of adequate infrastructure will be enforced. However, this is not within the gift of GBC. but, in the case of the road network, by Surrey Highways and Highways England both of whom will be influenced by budgetary constraints elsewhere within their jurisdiction. Equally traffic Impact assessments will be prepared, and paid for, by applicants and not by GBC and will therefore present a biased outcome in support of any development.

I object to the inclusion of all sites other than brownfield sites on the basis that that GBC will be unable to secure or enforce the provision of the requisite infrastructure provisions either by negotiation with developers or through other government agencies. Any development must be in current urban or brownfield site areas where there is already an appropriate infrastructure provision.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3830  **Respondent:** 15348641 / Clare Bennett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The proposed 35% increase in Horsley households as the result of the proposed 533 houses (plus smaller developments) seems completely disproportionate and cannot fail to impact on our already overstretched medical facilities, schools and roads.

Public parking in the small commercial areas for shopping etc is already very tight and the increase in household numbers would result in extreme under provision.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3834  **Respondent:** 15348705 / Richard Shaw  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The impact of the proposed development would have a hugely adverse impact on the quality of the environment in the two villages, radically altering their character. The proposals would effectively turn the two villages into a new town midway between the existing settlements of Guildford and Leatherhead, eroding the open spaces that are such an important feature in the identity of the Horsleys.D1

The proposals take no account of the inability of local infrastructure to cope with such a large scale of development. Already the roads through the villages carry much more traffic than they were designed for and are bedevilled by inappropriate commuter traffic and lorry use. The local surgery and schools are oversubscribed, and the Horsley station car park has no spare capacity. Parking in East Horsley village is also under pressure.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/3870  Respondent: 15349089 / Richard Young  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

This e-mail is to express my extreme reservations and my formal objection in relation to your proposals to build additional houses in The Horsleys.

My principle objections are that you have not fully considered the impact the additional houses will have on the community and local infrastructure.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

### Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/3875  Respondent: 15349217 / Philip Cole  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

4. The existing infrastructure in terms of roads, drainage, schools, and medical services, cannot sustain the additional need arising from such extensive housing. The roads around the village are already very busy and the car park at Horsley station is invariably full during the week. There are known sewage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North and Green lane areas. The Raleigh primary school, serving both East and West Horsley, is full every year, and the Howard of Effingham, the only secondary school with reasonable distance is oversubscribed every year. Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, which serves both Horsley villages, is struggling to cope with existing demand.

I should be grateful if you would take my views into account in this matter.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

### Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/3876  Respondent: 15349281 / Steve Aptel  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Objections to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)**

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objection to specific policies and matters within the Plan. Please ensure that I receive written confirmation that you have received this correspondence by emailing me your acknowledgement.
Please also ensure that my objections are seen by the relevant Planning Inspector.

I have itemised my objections below but also wish to support some of my points by recalling personal experience and other observations (A-C)

A. FLOODING: The Garlick’s Arch area is a catchment area for The East Clandon. This stream poses a significant flood risk to parts of Send Marsh, especially when there is heavy rainfall in a short time period. Any development of the Garlick’s Arch area will significantly increase the rate of “run off” and this is likely to overwhelm the capacity of the stream though Send Marsh.

B. Increased traffic congestion. Traffic levels in the area are already high. The road infrastructure cannot cope with more. This is highlighted when there is a problem on the A3 or M25. Traffic diverts through the Ripley / Burnt Common area and there is gridlock.

I respectfully remind Guildford Borough Council that it has a duty of care to residents and this must be taken into consideration when evaluating the impact of traffic in the area.

I respectfully remind Guildford Borough Council that it has a duty of care to residents and this must be taken into consideration when evaluating the impact of traffic in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3886</th>
<th>Respondent: 15349281 / Steve Aptel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13650</th>
<th>Respondent: 15349281 / Steve Aptel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/201  Respondent: 15349281 / Steve Aptel  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
As a regular visitor to Ripley I object to the local plan on the grounds of its bad effect on traffic in Ripley and Send, congestion,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

The planned addition of over 500 houses (probably housing in the order of another 1500 to 2000 people) in the Horsley's would have huge negative impact on the local community and would overload the already stretched infrastructure with significant deficiencies in the potential provision of additional Healthcare and parking in either of the Railway Stations. There is little or no Public transport, so this does not provide alternates. Schooling in particular is already oversubscribed and adding up to 1000 more children to the area would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

3. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in these villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Chilworth and Shalford, with no plan to improve that.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5222  Respondent: 15349761 / John Kettle  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3904  Respondent: 15349697 / Christine Hutchins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in these villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Chilworth and Shalford, with no plan to improve that.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Infrastructure - There is little detail on the Infrastructure required to support the proposed housing development. There is already an overload on East Horsley facilities such as Medical, schooling, parking and the narrow roads of this rural The usual suggestion is that the infrastructure will follow the developments but this is always years behind. The pressure on East Horsley from increased housing in East and West Horsley, as well as the prospect of a major (2000 homes) site at Wisley is frightening to those living in the Horsleys.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3946</th>
<th>Respondent: 15350273 / Molly Hutchins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much traffic in these villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Chilworth and Shalford, with no plan to improve that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3954</th>
<th>Respondent: 15350465 / Shirley Dicker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO the lack of immediate provision for new schools and doctors' surgeries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At present Guildford remains a pleasant place to visit and in which to live but I have no doubt these plans would seriously affect the town not for the better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3965</th>
<th>Respondent: 15350561 / Janet Riddiford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. No specific plan has been given or has it been acknowledged how congested Guilford is already. Firstly the existing infrastructure needs to be sorted out and after that would be the time to get funding and expand the the roads and railways but this will need extensive investments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4005  
Respondent: 15351521 / Pamela Bristow  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposed number of houses to be built in and around the village in a relatively short time which would seriously impact on local amenities

1. Public transport is almost non-existant therefore more and more cars will be using the roads which are already very busy particularly at school times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4018  
Respondent: 15351873 / Magaret Winborn  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the development of so many houses in one area of the Borough. Schools, public services and medical facilities are stretched so cannot take any increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4041  
Respondent: 15352321 / Nick Wooff  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

There is too much traffic in these villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Chilworth and Shalford, with no plan to improve that.
I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4050</th>
<th>Respondent: 15353025 / David Helm</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly object to the local plan all our infrastructure is overloaded now.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4057</th>
<th>Respondent: 15353217 / Vali Drummond</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Create a new area with its own holistic health clinic, school, shops and everything for a new community, including cycle tracks and maybe some stables for horses to be used on the land and for transport too.

This is a practical and fair way forward we think.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4060</th>
<th>Respondent: 15353345 / Mike Mellstrom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have lived in Horsley since a child in the 60's and attended local schools in that time i have seen a massive change in the facilities and infrastructure of the village and local area.

Already the roads around Horsley are pot holed and in bad repair the A3 is now bottled necked everyday around Junction 10 M25.

The waiting time to get an appointment at the local doctors is now over 2 weeks and there are no places at the local schools.

All this is before any of the proposed 593 houses in the Horsley as well as the possible 2000 at Wisley i strongly feel that Horsley cannot support this level of development.
With all these projects it will be a few developers and land owners who will make a massive profit and the local community who will once more suffer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4065  Respondent: 15353505 / Susan Mazalon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3) The impact on our local services will be highly detrimental. Already, the stress of getting into the local doctors surgery at a suitable time or even just finding a suitable place to park can be very stressful to a large number of older residents in particular. Parking in the village is already poor especially at the weekend where even a minor event such as a wedding can make it extremely difficult. How will schooling cope? You are already adding to a county wide crisis of building more new homes with ever decreasing neighbourhood facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4081  Respondent: 15353633 / Neal Stone  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5. I OBJECT to Policy I1: there is very poor consideration for the infrastructure needed to support the proposed changes. Such lack of consideration calls the thoroughness of the entire document into question for me. Local roads are hardly considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4133  Respondent: 15356321 / Mark Aljoe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed increase in the number of dwellings in the Horsley area. The schools are already full. It is almost impossible to get a Doctor’s appointment without a week or two’s delay. It is difficult to park for the shops and the volumes of traffic are already equivalent to that of a busy town rather than 2 villages. Please reconsider!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4136</th>
<th>Respondent: 15356353 / Pam Patrick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3). Our schools are full.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) It is difficult to get an appointment with our doctors, they are always so extremely busy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4148</th>
<th>Respondent: 15356705 / Sandra Madgwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the very serious issues it that of utilities of all kinds, but most notable in the area is that of drainage. This has been well documented over many years, including houses in New Inn Lane having raw sewage in their gardens, and the ‘run off’ from another 2,000 homes on Gosden Hill doesn’t bear thinking about. The schools, health services and community support systems will need to be doubled, so how will this be funded? We cannot afford the extra funding, and in spite of promises of improvements by past developers, nothing has been forthcoming.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I therefore register my official objection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4150</th>
<th>Respondent: 15356769 / Jennifer Galloway</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The infrastructure such as roads, water &amp; sewage &amp; schools to name three seem to be planned for after the building of houses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/4162 | Respondent: 15356801 / Clare Harlow | Agent: |
9. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming even more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Comment ID: PSLPP16/4204  Respondent: 15357217 / Camilla Cressy  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Drs surgery is already impossible to get appointments at so more people living in the area would cause a massive strain on that.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4208  Respondent: 15357249 / Seon Jeong  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly believe that any development plan should go hand in hand with other social infrastructure, hence if you plan to build more houses, people also need roads to get access, schools, shops, etc. alongside them.

Thank you very much for your attention and I hope you make a wise and sensible decision about the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4217  Respondent: 15357697 / Ros Reeves  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object most strongly to the latest 2016 Local Plan as it is not sustainable. The plan involves more houses, more industrial buildings, more lorries, more traffic congestion, more pressure on medical surgeries and more pressure on school places as well as open spaces being a thing of the past.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4225  Respondent: 15357761 / Ross Haimes  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Education

I have two young sons, my eldest is 3 years old and we hope that he manages to get a place at Burpham Foundation Primary School for the 2017 intake and then on to the George Abbott when he is 11. Schools in the local area are heavily oversubscribed and adding 2,000 homes to the local area will obviously make the situation much worse. There is insufficient details about schooling and who will be providing additional school places for the Gosden Hill Farm development, as such the Local Plan should be considered unsound. I am very concerned that my children’s education will suffer due to this unnecessary development at Gosden Hill Farm.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
At present there is already very bad parking anywhere in Horsley village for visiting shopping areas, doctors surgeries and schools. The developments will change the whole character of the area and will no longer be the area which everyone has bought into and loved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

In addition the infrastructure of the area including roads, local facilities such as they are, as well as services for water and drainage are already stretched and in the latter case clearly insufficient. Ockham Road North and South have significant pinch points and the junction by Station Approach is dangerous without introducing more traffic with another junction close by to accommodate more housing by the station.

I understand that the local schools are also full and the medical facilities stretched, I must therefore object to the designation of this area as a District Centre, which clearly it is not nor could be.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Existing village boundaries reflect the ability of the local infrastructure to provide reasonably for the current population. However, the local infrastructure is already overloaded and at times struggles to cope: there are not enough school places, our medical facilities are stretched, the roads and car parks have reached their capacity and the trains are frequently full. We cannot accommodate a significant increase in the local population without people’s quality of life being seriously affected. To increase housing in the Horsleys by over 30% would put a completely unreasonable strain on these villages. Extension of the village boundaries now is a precursor to even more potential development which would be even more detrimental to the environment for existing and new residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policies I1,I2,I3,

I further object to: in a nut-shell, the roads and infrastructure pose a limit to the enforced growth which GBC want to implement; the roads simply could not cope with major increases in vehicles that will derive from increased development and foul waste / rain water drainage are at full capacity already.

Ripley is a good example of the every day build up in traffic congestion: infilling within the Parish boundary and use of the High St. as an ad hoc by-pass for the A3, has pushed levels to saturation at certain times. With greater than 5,000 houses planned close to Ripley, this will inevitably lead to massive grid lock and higher levels of pollution they already registered. This latter point contradicts the intention stipulated within I3, in regard to mitigation of detrimental impact on air quality and public health.

I would also add that to date none of the developments within Ripley's boundary have been charged with improving the community's local road network or foul waste systems. As a matter of common sense IMO that situation will soon become unsustainable in the face of increases in housing and vehicles, unless there are major improvements in infrastructure, paid for by the developers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4345  Respondent: 15360065 / Alan Staines  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3) Infrastructure already in overload.

The local schools are full.

Medical facilities are stretched.

Drainage is inadequate.

Roads and car parks are overloaded with little

or no scope for improvements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9579  Respondent: 15360321 / Jean Miller  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The local infrastructure is patently unable to cope with the growth assumed in the Plan as doctors’ surgeries, schools and particularly roads, are currently struggling to cope with the needs of the existing population. Specifically, there is an omission to the Plan as it excludes the Town Centre Master Plan and the effect this could have on the infrastructure, specifically traffic in the outlying villages.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4373  **Respondent:** 15366209 / Corinne Singleton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7. **I OBJECT TO** the lack of immediate provision for new schools

   1. **I OBJECT TO** the lack of any immediate provision for new Doctors surgeries

   1. **I OBJECT TO** the fact that any new buildings in the proposed areas will increase the already large flow of traffic that comes through Ripley and Send.

   2. **10. I OBJECT TO** the fact that you are not proposing to use any brown field sites and it was part of the Conservatives mandate to 'SAVE THE GREENBELT'

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4377  **Respondent:** 15366529 / Roger Singleton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7. **I OBJECT TO** the lack of immediate provision for new schools

   1. **I OBJECT TO** the lack of any immediate provision for new Doctors surgeries

   2. **I OBJECT TO** the fact that any new buildings in the proposed areas will increase the already large flow of traffic that comes through Ripley and Send.

   3. **I OBJECT TO** the fact that you are not proposing to use any brown field sites and it was part of the Conservatives mandate to 'SAVE THE GREENBELT'

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4379  **Respondent:** 15366721 / Sylvia Newton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I Object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools

I Object to the lack of any immediate provision for larger or more doctors surgeries

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4402  Respondent: 15367361 / Greg Ganjou  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get
worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4433  **Respondent:** 15368129 / Sharon Cork  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4472  **Respondent:** Nicola Owens  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**NFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES**

This section of the Proposed Submission Local Plan sets out details covering a range of infrastructure policies.

**POLICIES I1 Infrastructure & Delivery**

I2, Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’

I3 Sustainable Transport.

I support the general policy statements in each area but the detailed infrastructure proposals appear inadequate. There are serious deficiencies in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and GBC’s aggressive housing policy in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will make this worse. There appears to be no strategic plan for additional capacity in schooling and health care and for the narrow and already busy roads in the Horsley area.

If every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The impact on local roads and transport facilities will be enormous. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations, which are currently at capacity, at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected. Local schools are already at capacity and no extra places are planned in the Horsleys.

The proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guilesall Lane (single track with passing places!), Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. Traffic approaching Guildford from the M25 at peak times is already queuing back as the A3 goes from 3 to 2 lanes at the Guildford junction. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. The Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without identifying what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required.

I **OBJECT** to the proposals for infrastructure because they are inadequate to support the proposed developments

**POLICYA39: Land behind Ockham Road North, near Horsley railway station**
Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. I believe that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

I OBJECT to Policy A39.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4473</th>
<th>Respondent: 15368609 / E Dunkerley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To help a more detailed discussion could you please

Give outline Road Structure Map of the initial scheme of the proposed developments

Give estimated traffic flow/transport details (Fully understand these will be estimates) using the new proposed new roads

Outline "traffic management" plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4541</th>
<th>Respondent: 15368993 / Tessa Spink</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. POLICY I

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

9. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Glandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, I (and other residents) will see our quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4616  Respondent: 15370593 / A Gee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4638  **Respondent:** 15370689 / C.E. Phillips  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.

I object to lack of infrastructure for the sites in and around Send. Many of the utilities in the area are at or very close to their maximum capacity, such as the electrical network and main drainage/sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no developments in this village. The local Send Medical Centre is now operating at full capacity, are they any plans to increase this service?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Other Basic Infrastructure - There are no detailed plans for other essential infrastructure, power lines, sewerage, drainage, medical facilities, education and other transport options such as park and ride facility and rail station. The plan is again unsound.

The Royal Surrey County Hospital can barely cope with the population it serves now. There are no details as to how it will cope with potential 25% population increase. The Plan is again flawed and unsound.

Other Basic Infrastructure continued - The current water supply is barely sufficient for the current population as evident when Clandon House (built 1720s) burnt to a shell in April 2015 due to lack of water supply available to extinguish flames effectively. Currently the water supply for the Guildford area runs out in 4 hrs. The Plan is therefore unsound on this basis as it has no detail of how further supply would be achieved.

There is no capacity in the current sewerage system for expansion. The Plan is therefore unsound on this basis.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the fact that infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels—roads, doctors, schools will not be able to cope;

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of the identities of the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4713 Respondent: 15372417 / P. Mew Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Glandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
10. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/783</th>
<th>Respondent: 15373153 / C R Woodland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the local plan as much of the development proposed is on the Green Belt without being constrained by infrastructure, for example roads and a number of schools are at capacity already.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4767</th>
<th>Respondent: 15373313 / Hugo Holden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4787</th>
<th>Respondent: 15377473 / Deborah Holden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4808  Respondent: 15377793 / Robin Dabbs  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO NO CONFIRMATION FOR ALLEGED HOUSING NEED NOS. I OBJECT TO LACK OF IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR NEW SCHOOLS

I OBJECT TO NO IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR DOCTORS SURGERIES

I OBJECT TO THE LACK OF ALL INFRASTRUCTURE BEFORE HOUSING & INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

I OBJECT TO THE ADDED IMPACT ON EXISTING ROADS LINKING: SEND - OLD WOKING, BURNT COMMON - RIPLEY, RIPLEY - E. CLANDON, A3-M25

I OBJECT TO PRIORITISING GREEN BELT DEVELOPMENT OVER BROWNFIELD WHICH COULD SUPPORT 50% BUILDING

I OBJECT TO INCORRECT HANDLING OF DEVELOPMENT THROUGH REGULATION 19 INSTEAD OF REGULATION 18

I OBJECT TO FURTHER INDUSTRIAL SPACE AT BURNT COMMON AFTER THE 80% REDUCTION IN EMPLOYMENT SPACE IN 2013

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4810  Respondent: 15377825 / Christopher Dabbs  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO NO CONFIRMATION FOR ALLEGED HOUSING NEED NOS. I OBJECT TO LACK OF IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR NEW SCHOOLS

I OBJECT TO NO IMMEDIATE PROVISION FOR DOCTORS SURGERIES

I OBJECT TO THE LACK OF ALL INFRASTRUCTURE BEFORE HOUSING & INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

I OBJECT TO INCORRECT HANDLING OF DEVELOPMENT THROUGH REGULATION 19 INSTEAD OF REGULATION 18

I OBJECT TO FURTHER INDUSTRIAL SPACE AT BURNT COMMON AFTER THE 80% REDUCTION IN EMPLOYMENT SPACE IN 2013
I OBJECT TO THE ADDED IMPACT ON EXISTING ROADS LINKING: SEND - OLD WOKING, BURNT COMMON - RIPLEY, RIPLEY - E. CLANDON, A3-M25

I OBJECT TO PRIORITISING GREEN BELT DEVELOPMENT OVER BROWNFIELD WHICH COULD SUPPORT 50% BUILDING

I OBJECT TO INCORRECT HANDLING OF DEVELOPMENT THROUGH REGULATION 19 INSTEAD OF REGULATION 18

I OBJECT TO FURTHER INDUSTRIAL SPACE AT BURNT COMMON AFTER THE 80% REDUCTION IN EMPLOYMENT SPACE IN 2013

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4835  Respondent: 15377953 / cctvtraining.com ltd (Gordon Tyerman)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY II Infrastructure and delivery

GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION Various aspects of Infrastructure are acknowledged as congested, inadequate for the existing population and not able to accommodate much growth. However, greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – are targeted in order to generate CIL income for the council. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The Council’s methodology assessing traffic and roads infrastructure needs is inadequate. It identifies only the tip of the iceberg in terms of existing congestion. Looking at local traffic situations around the Borough it becomes clear that the schemes proposed will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed locations would require highway schemes that involve demolition of property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4853  Respondent: 15379969 / Teresa Britton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY II
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4925</th>
<th>Respondent: 15380289 / Stephen Hewlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Congested local roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited safe parking for local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Future years of heavy building companies etc would ruin local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4936</th>
<th>Respondent: 15381089 / Tim Poyntz</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Local Doctors, Health centres, hospitals are full to capacity now!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local policing already overworked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local schools etc already full to overflowing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable. Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4980  **Respondent:** 15381441 / Gillian Ward  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6). Increase in Traffic. I1

The inevitable increase in traffic as a result of more housing in this area will create more pollution in the form of exhaust gases and noise which will have an unhealthy effect on residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5013  **Respondent:** 15382529 / Reuben Lee  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

14. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

15. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The amount of new housing outlined is disproportionate to that proposed elsewhere in the Borough and will swamp this rural area, changing its character and appearance forever. No infrastructure is proposed to support the development, which is contrary to National Planning Policy. The existing infrastructure: schools, roads, medical centre, sewage etc can not cope now. In addition a number of the sites regularly flood.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5122  Respondent: 15385985 / Sally Almeida  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

All of the above I strongly disapprove of the traffic is already horrendous at any time of the day not only at peck times.

Doctors surgery already stretched to its limit.

Schools full with parents having to look elsewhere not getting into their local schools.

I Object to send Village being removed from the green Belt.

SendMarsh Rd is already a busy road with fast traffic approaching the junction to the Portsmouth Rd this will be a disaster zone.

I request that my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector who will decide.

I request confirmation that Guildford have received my request.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5133  Respondent: 15386017 / Gareth Sinnett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a precondition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development nonviable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon
existing health services. Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5152  **Respondent:** 15386337 / Edna Slater  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

1. **POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPP16/5178  Respondent: 15388641 / Eva Hay  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the fact that the infrastructure requirements for all of the borough have not been investigated properly and are totally inadequate to deal with proposed development levels. Highways, public transport, medical facilities and schools are already at full capacity in this area and will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5194  Respondent: 15388673 / Bruce Stewart  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY II

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5207  Respondent: 15388865 / Andrew Powell-Cullingford  Agent: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is no actual confirmed provision for any major road infrastructure to improve the current congestion, let alone cope with an additional 10000 car movements on the local roads around Ripley as a result of sites A43, A25 and A35 which are an allocation of nearly 4500 homes along a short stretch of the A3. It is extremely unlikely that many journeys will be anything other than by car given the location of these 3 sites. The A3 is already at capacity according to Highways England and they have no intention of even looking at this section of the A3 until at least 2020, with an earliest estimate of any further works unlikely until at least 2027. The local road network is made up of a significant proportion of narrow, poorly maintained, unlit country lanes with no possibility of mitigation. In addition, these lanes are frequently flooded after heavy rainfall and suffer from significant water runoff from surrounding agricultural land. This traffic congestion is clearly already a significant problem for the current residents of Ripley, Send, Horsleys and Clandon who cannot be expected to endure further traffic chaos with the suggested locations of these huge new sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5213  Respondent:  15388865 / Andrew Powell-Cullingford  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, medical facilities etc. are at or close to capacity in this area of the borough and will not therefore be capable of coping with such high numbers of additional housing and industrial employment space.

There are no plans to improve or make provision to increase the capacity of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

The site at Garlick's Arch is also traversed by high voltage electricity pylons with no provision for either removal, burial or re-siting and it is unclear as to who will meet the substantial costs involved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7886  Respondent:  15388865 / Andrew Powell-Cullingford  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure
There is no actual confirmed provision for any major road infrastructure to improve the current congestion, let alone cope with an additional 10000 car movements on the local roads around Ripley as a result of sites A43, A25 and A35 which are an allocation of nearly 4500 homes along a short stretch of the A3. It is extremely unlikely that many journeys will be anything other than by cargo. The location of these 3 sites. The A3 is already at capacity according to Highways England and they have no intention of even looking at this section of the A3 until at least 2020, with an earliest estimate of any further works unlikely until at least 2027. The local road network is made up of a significant proportion of narrow, poorly maintained, unlit country lanes with no possibility of mitigation. In addition, these lanes are frequently flooded after heavy rainfall and suffer from significant water runoff from surrounding agricultural land. This traffic congestion is clearly already a significant problem for the current residents of Ripley, Send, Horselys and Clandon who cannot be expected to endure further traffic chaos with the suggested locations of these huge new sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7965  Respondent: 15388865 / Andrew Powell-Cullingford  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick's Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule 10 support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, medical facilities etc. are at or close to capacity in this area of the borough and will not therefore be capable of coping with such high numbers of additional housing and industrial employment space.

There are no plans to improve or make provision to increase the capacity of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

The site at Garlick's Arch is also traversed by high voltage electricity pylons with no provision for either removal, burial or re-sitting and it is unclear as to who will meet the substantial costs involved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5218  Respondent: 15389025 / Keith Cogan  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the large proposed development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and again produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send. The local infrastructure is completely inadequate to deal with the proposed housing levels. These are massive areas of lovely countryside and protected Green Belt that is just being turned into urban areas. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope. I also object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will have a massive impact on the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which as I have...
already mentioned is already well above full capacity. The A3 is already massively gridlocked both northbound onto the M25 and southbound as it passes Guildford!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5228  Respondent: 15389089 / R.A. Norfolk  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5237  Respondent: 15389121 / M.C. Hollister  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5254  Respondent: 15389185 / M. Patrick  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5260  Respondent: 15389217 / B.J. Blair  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5267  Respondent: 15389249 / Michael Dixey  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5283  Respondent: 15389281 / Anthony Smith  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5290  Respondent: 15389345 / Peter Reynolds  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5309  Respondent: 15389697 / Oliver Stewart  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. **POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the Borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5344  Respondent: 15390337 / Daniel Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5359  Respondent: 15390401 / William Stewart  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the Borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5411  Respondent: 15391681 / Martin Pope  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country Janes to absorb

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5417  Respondent: 15391905 / Geoff Gear  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The village school is over-subscribed therefore has no places for additional pupils. This would mean any additional children in the area would have to go to schools further afield, thus causing even more congestion on the already too busy local roads during rush hour. With all the extra proposed traffic, Send could possibly be gridlocked all day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5418  Respondent: 15397505 / Andrew Krisson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally wlf'eali stic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5425  Respondent: 15397793 / Sheila Collins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5428  Respondent: 15397793 / Sheila Collins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

What is it with G.B.C? Are you determined to ruin our historic villages? For what purpose I wonder?

I invite you to stand in Ripley High St at the junction of Newark lane between 5-6pm approx. The queue sometimes stretches back to the roundabout. All sorts of vehicles use Newark Lane even though it should be width restricted. It is dangerous to walk down and parents have to walk this route in the mornings to get children to school!

The hooting and swearing outside our home on a regular basis is dreadful. And you’re thinking of increasing the traffic!!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5433  Respondent: 15397953 / Gillian Dobson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5442  Respondent: 15397953 / Gillian Dobson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick's Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5438  **Respondent:** 15398081 / Jill Pope  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5455  **Respondent:** 15398497 / G J Masson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The present transport links and infrastructure is completely unable to sustain the level of development proposed and the increased traffic flows which will result. The proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC) is unsound and will result in gridlock and terminal congestion in the Burpham area particularly if the proposed Clay Lane link to Slyfield goes ahead which at present proposes to use the same corridor and northbound slip road onto the A3.

The plan does not address the strategic problem of the A3 which is critical to the area; additional slip roads and roundabouts will only add to the volume of traffic and the ensuing congestion that is being created at present and another route or link to the M25 needs to be considered or other alternatives explored such as widening the A3 or the creation of a tunnel to ease Guildford's traffic problems and the increasing volume of traffic that is being generated on the A3.

It needs radical change before any of the proposed schemes can go ahead as the transport infrastructure is a major constraint on any future schemes and this problem should be addressed before and not after development goes ahead.

There ought to be an alternative to the A3. Consideration should be given to widening and improving the A25/A246 to provide an improved route to the M25 via Fetcham and Leatherhead to the A24 and J9 of the M25.

Any future developments could then be orientated to the A25/A246 rather than cascading yet more traffic onto the A3 and thereby compromising the identities and centres of the existing 'spring line' villages and Burpham in particular which is just not designed to cope with the volume of traffic that will be generated by these proposals.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
2. All the new housing developments: It is true we need more houses, but then we also need the wider roads, the transport, the parking places, the schooling as well the clinic and health department. All the talking is about so many houses, but not one word if you planning a new station, etc.

The roads in East Horsley or the Horsley are terribly narrow. These enormous trucks taking the right away the bigger family cars this is asking for many accidents. Then there will be no facility for medical dealing with it, the parking at the stations are not big enough. So start with the essential construction to create a new village such as shops, schooling, medical place, station, electricity, gas, telephone lines and sewer system.

When that is in place, then think of all the heavy trucks going using the short cut in our village, so narrow the entrance into our roads from the A3, 246, and Cobham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong>, is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. There is the local school with young children walking along the road on a Monday to Friday basis, which is dangerous with the current level of traffic prior to any increased traffic that would result from further housing on the proposed scale.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPP16/5520  <strong>Respondent:</strong> 15399041 / Sue Ely  <strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied? In summary the health and safety of existing communities are detrimentally impacted.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5527  **Respondent:** 15399521 / Barbara J Aldrick  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

Congestion on roads unsustainable - narrow roads especially in Burpham at roundabout London Road, Inn Lane. Existing A3 to deal with additional demand until? 2023-2027.

Major transport issues are unresulted apparently e.g. tunnel?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5555  **Respondent:** 15400641 / Anne Barker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5592  **Respondent:** 15400769 / H L Cunnah  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I write to note my objections to the Proposed Local Plan. That the Local Borough could propose such a plan, with total disregard for the necessary infrastructure for it to be in any way viable is nothing short of ludicrous. My main objections, which echo the sentiments of almost the entire village, are as follows:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Schools & Medical Facilities/Local Amenities** -

   Local schools are already at capacity - where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys. We specifically moved to the area as a family so that our daughter could be schooled at the local school. Already bursting at the seams, there is no provision for the extra potential 1000 children to be educated. WHERE WILL THESE CHILDREN GO TO SCHOOL? The same problem exists with the local health centre. There is again no provision whatsoever. There is similarly no plan for the necessary local amenities for the additional homes. Where are we to shop? It seems the ‘plan’ is to throw up as many houses as possible, ignore the Green Belt and hope for the best.

2. **Increased Traffic and Lack of Parking Facilities** -

   On the assumption that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a 3-mile radius of the Horsleys. The impact on local roads will be awful. The roads are already in a terrible state, continually crumbling due to the strain of existing traffic and poor drainage causing flooding. Parking at Horsley & Effingham Junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be untenable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10724</th>
<th>Respondent: 15400769 / H L Cunnah</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I write to note my objections to the Proposed Local Plan. That the Local Borough could propose such a plan, with total disregard for the necessary infrastructure for it to be in any way viable is nothing short of ludicrous. My main objections, which echo the sentiments of almost the entire village, are as follows:

(1) Schools & Medical Facilities/Local Amenities -

Local schools are already at capacity - where will newcomers go to school? No extra places are planned in the Horsleys. We specifically moved to the area as a family so that our daughter could be schooled at the local school. Already bursting at the seams, there is no provision for the extra potential 1000 children to be educated. WHERE WILL THESE CHILDREN GO TO SCHOOL? The same problem exists with the local health centre. There is again no provision whatsoever. There is similarly no plan for the necessary local amenities for the additional homes. Where are we to shop? It seems the ‘plan’ is to throw up as many houses as possible, ignore the Green Belt and hope for the best.

(2) Increased Traffic and Lack of Parking Facilities -

On the assumption that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a 3-mile radius of the Horsleys. The impact on local roads will be awful. The roads are already in a terrible state, continually crumbling due to the strain of existing traffic and poor drainage causing flooding. Parking at Horsley & Effingham Junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be untenable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5613</th>
<th>Respondent: 15401281 / James Fowler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country Janes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5617</th>
<th>Respondent: 15401313 / Mr &amp; Mrs Wing</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much more detailed information needed on infrastructure, including significant local road improvements to cope with the increase of 2 car families, and timing of road widening to the very congested A3, as well as details of the new intersection to cope with substantial additional housing which will directly affect BU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details required of proposed new sewers to cope with increase in population and increased water supply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of detailed information regarding the proposals for a road tunnel, before Gosden Hill Farm can ever be considered for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5618</th>
<th>Respondent: 15404449 / H Albertyn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My wife and I recently bought a property in west horsley near the Raleigh school. We moved from London to get away from all the rush but if all these new houses will be built in our area then it will ruin the whole experience. The Horsleys are not geared up for all this and the roads are already in a poor state so I cannot imagine what it will be like with all the additional traffic. The station car park will be overfull, we wont be able to see the local GP, there will be a scramble for school spaces and the whole village feel will be gone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the day this area is outside the M25 and if more houses are needed then this should be built within that zone as most of these people will be commuting to the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I urge you to reconsider this proposal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure.

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large...
infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5680</th>
<th>Respondent: 15406017 / Eleanor Roberts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5700  Respondent: 15406145 / Paul Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It also strikes me that there is a huge amount of housing being proposed without the accompanying infrastructure provision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/295  Respondent: 15406145 / Paul Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5702  Respondent: 15406305 / Felicity Griffiths  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Although I live in Cobham. This plan would severely impact on our area. One of our main objects is the fact that Cobham is the nearest shopping centre to the proposed development. Cobham cannot possible cope with any increase in traffic - let alone some 5000 additional occupiers.
Also, there has been a suggestion that Cobham & Stoke d'Abernon station could be used as an alternative station to Effingham and Horsley. It is almost impossible to find a parking space in Cobham station carpark already. Any additional passengers would make the situation intolerable.

These are only two of many objections - but ones which would impact on our lives in Cobham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16603  Respondent: 15406305 / Felicity Griffiths  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Although I live in Cobham. This plan would severely impact on our area. One of our main objects is the fact that Cobham is the nearest shopping centre to the proposed development. Cobham cannot possible cope with any increase in traffic - let alone some 5000 additional occupiers.

Also, there has been a suggestion that Cobham & Stoke d'Abernon station could be used as an alternative station to Effingham and Horsley. It is almost impossible to find a parking space in Cobham station carpark already. Any additional passengers would make the situation intolerable.

These are only two of many objections - but ones which would impact on our lives in Cobham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5703  Respondent: 15406433 / Jean Bridger  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to add, as one interested in the amenity of our more elderly members the need for a return of the town's shuttle bus service which enabled them to cope with our 'hilly' town. It really should be called the shopper's bus because, apart from helping elderly people -it would benefit the wider population as, as in the past it called at the Railway Station and the Bus Station before serving the top of the town, including G live before returning via North St

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5712  Respondent: 15406529 / David I Allan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We are writing to object strongly to the proposed New Local Plan published by the Guildford Borough Council on 6th June, 2016. As a resident of East Horsley for 18 years we are concerned that the proposed developments will irreversibly alter the nature of the Horsley villages by over-burdening an already stretched infrastructure, the consequence of which will be a material degradation in the quality of the village community and the surrounding environment, itself an area of outstanding natural beauty. It is also clear that there are no adequate plans to cater for the increased infrastructure requirements were the plans to be approved in terms of sufficient additional community facilities for example, medical facilities, increased road traffic management and community and railway car parks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

We simply do not have the infrastructure to support even this infill development never mind the proposals contained in the local plan. Dr's Surgeries are very busy and appointments increasingly difficult to make.

Roads are totally inadequate with big lorries screaming through the village (there should be a weight limit).

Parking is very difficult most of the time and impossible some of the time. The flooding issue is not contained. Whenever there is heavy rainfall there is excessive surface water and flooding on the main roads. The main arterial road A3 is frequently blocked and the fact that we have the research Park, the university, the cathedral, and the hospital all pouring on to it at the same junction make it a no go area at certain times. This situation is not going to be helped by the proposals to build thousands of houses in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5812</th>
<th>Respondent: 15408097 / Rolf Horst</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Sixthly I <strong>object</strong> to the unacceptable density of the proposed housing for West Horsley. This is far higher than the current density and it is likely to lead to houses totally out of character with the existing village and no sustainability in terms of schooling, drainage, roads capacity, shops and public transport.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16670</th>
<th>Respondent: 15408097 / Rolf Horst</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of traffic has increased with an alarming rate over the last 15 years - not only due to many newly built houses (infill) but also due to Satelite Navigation systems sending traffic from the A246 through East Horsley to the A3 and A246. The roads are barely wide enough to accommodate the heavy load of lorries, coaches, large 4x4s and other traffic. Very often there is nowhere to park in the village as the car park behind the shops fills up very rapidly these days. So THE HORSLEYS ARE FULL.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I therefore strongly object to the horrifying idea of building any more houses in or around the Horsleys.</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5815</th>
<th>Respondent: 15408385 / Olga Sitkovetsky</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The infrastructure of our villages cannot cope with many more residents. The schools are full, the Doctor's surgery is almost impossible to get an appointment with. The trains into London are to full capacity as is the parking facility at the train station.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of traffic has increased with an alarming rate over the last 15 years - not only due to many newly built houses (infill) but also due to Satelite Navigation systems sending traffic from the A246 through East Horsley to the A3 and A246. The roads are barely wide enough to accommodate the heavy load of lorries, coaches, large 4x4s and other traffic. Very often there is nowhere to park in the village as the car park behind the shops fills up very rapidly these days. So THE HORSLEYS ARE FULL.</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilities

The huge additional housing both in numbers and percentage terms will have a significant impact on the infrastructure. Specifically:

- **Doctors Surgery** – I have an 88 year old mother and making an appointment at the surgery is very difficult. If an additional 533 houses are built in the Horsleys, which is a huge percentage increase it will become impossible.
- **Parking** – Is at its limit at both the station and at the East Horsley shops and there is no obvious way of extending this to cope with the additional cars from 533 extra houses.
- **Roads** – All the local roads are country lanes either without pavements or single sided pavements. Again the area will not be able to cope and there is no scope for improvement.
- **Schools** – Are at full capacity so there is no where for additional children to go to school at either primary or secondary level.
- **Surface water flooding** – Is particularly serious in East Lane and elsewhere in the villages of West Horsley and East Horsley. East Lane is flooded every year during storms. The development either side of East Lane will make this worse as will the developments elsewhere in the Horsley villages
- **Water supply** – Is very weak.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road traffic accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. This comes at a time when many of the local schools are trying to encourage cycling within their School's Travel Plans (STP's).

Most of the local rural roads also do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. To example, in Clandon, where footpaths do exist, they are often very narrow in places with construction lorries mounting pavements in order to pass, and this has been already well documented by West Clandon Parish Council.

10. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, I share the view that my family and I along with all other existing residents' in the locality will see our quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site. The farm land around the South bound extension, floods regularly. Should this development go ahead, I expect that the flood waters will be pushed close to my property and will present greater risk of flooding.

I also note that without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and very likely be overwhelmed. It is well documented that many local services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I am also concerned with the general reduction in future Police funding (Surrey Police identified that it needed to save £28.4m over the four years of the spending review between March 2011 and March 2015). Savings have been made, but their scope with new developments will increase, creating extra pressure. This will have further impact to all local residents as local Police will have 13,860 new homes during the plan period.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16715</th>
<th>Respondent: 15411137 / Jacky and Jon Hurst</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clandon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our roads are heavily congested already and the risk of flooding is very great in this area and the Wey and Thames Valleys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16720</th>
<th>Respondent: 15411457 / Emily Beynon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We are objecting to the quantity of new houses being proposed in the Horsleys!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is already a very congested area with limited parking in the village and overstretched services for schools and medical.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The drainage is a huge problem with flooding including sewage often occurring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5888</th>
<th>Respondent: 15411457 / Emily Beynon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenities such as shops, schools, post office, medical centre (East Horsley) and public transport (Horsley station - the car park of which is already over-capacity!), to say nothing of the narrow, poorly maintained roads through the Horsleys (already too dangerous for me to consider cycling or walking and regularly closed due to flooding) would be pushed beyond breaking point!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amenities such as shops, schools, post office, medical centre (East Horsley) and public transport (Horsley station - the car park of which is already over-capacity!), to say nothing of the narrow, poorly maintained roads through the Horsleys (already too dangerous for me to consider cycling or walking and regularly closed due to flooding) would be pushed beyond breaking point!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5905  Respondent: 15412001 / S Richardson  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The road infrastructure is inadequate to cope with any further development in the area. The A247 running through West Clandon is narrow and dangerous and is overloaded with traffic, before any major housing or business developments take place in the area. Traffic is always congested at peak times and many other times heading north on the A3 with cars trying to access the M25. Regularly the M25 is closed and all the traffic comes through the Clandons. Also Stag Hill is congested each night.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5967  Respondent: 15419425 / Fields Behind Shalford Village Hall Pres (Charles Meade-King)  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Infrastructure issues:

There are, as the consultation documentation recognises, important infrastructure requirements if there is to be any further housing development in the Guildford area. With regard to Shalford the A281 needs relief and not more traffic joining an already congested road. If, as is widely anticipated, the Broadford brown site development in Shalford proceeds this will test the stretched infrastructure and should not be compounded by development on the fields behind the Village Hall. Chinthurst Lane is a rural lane without footways. Many residents, including children, those with pushchairs, walkers and runners are forced to use the carriageway. The traffic generated by additional houses would aggravate the current vehicle/pedestrian conflict in the lane and be at odds with its attractive semi rural character. Since land adjoining the carriageway is in part in private ownership, in part registered common land and the provision of footways would spoil the lane's character, the absence of footways will continue to exist. The Society objects to the fact that the infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels - roads, doctors, schools will not be able to cope if there is development before suitable infrastructure arrangements are in hand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5980  Respondent: 15420417 / C Martin  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

At the present time there are understood to be some 2808 houses in East and West Horsley combined and if the present Local Plan is adopted it would add 533 houses on 'large' sites and 60 houses on 'small' sites within these two villages - a 21% increase! As Horsley residents, we think it is excessive and objectionable.

This increase, moreover, should be viewed against the proposed developments within a 5 mile radius of Horsley, in particular 2000 houses on the Wisley Airfield site, 400 on Burnt Common, and 2000 at Gosden Hill Farm, making in all 4993 houses, a staggering total which will, in our opinion, completely ruin the current attractive rural character of the area.

It is thought that the inflated number of new proposed houses arises from a 'Strategic Housing Market Assessment' that was generated by a consultant's mathematical model - not revealed in the Plan. That housing number has been increased by GBC to give a population increase which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough, which thus leads to alarming results.

It is not just the increase in housing which is relevant, but all the changes that come with it - for example, the increase in population and household cars, demands for school, medical practitioners and hospital places, and transport facilities, which have to be considered against the existing positions. In the Horsleys, the local schools are full, medical facilities stretched, roads are overloaded and drainage inadequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the road's serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough's infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan's determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes
infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6046</th>
<th>Respondent: 15422145 / Orlando Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6047</th>
<th>Respondent: 15422145 / Orlando Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6061  **Respondent:** 15422529 / David Roberts  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.
This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16860  Respondent: 15422625 / Graham Burrows  Agent:

document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the lack of immediate provision of new schools
• I object to the development adding more traffic to an already very busy road, with traffic using the area as cut through from other over populated areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6087  Respondent: 15422849 / Ryan Clarke and Lauren Emberson  Agent:

document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
   In our short time here, we have already noted there is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no apparent plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6099  Respondent: 15422849 / Ryan Clarke and Lauren Emberson  Agent:

document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
   The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity. There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()

School facilities

I object to the plan on the grounds of the impact to local schools, which are already at capacity and with an extensive waiting list. There are no extra places are planned in the Horsleys, and the school places proposed at Wisley Airfield will not planned until many years into the project.

Traffic & parking

I object to the plan on the grounds of the additional vehicles and impact this will have on local parking and local roads. Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the Horsley villages. Parking at the, already full, stations, local shops and amenities will all be seriously affected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure.

The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The A247 through West Clandon is a real issue of concern as an "A" road with inadequate width, inadequate lighting and inadequate speed control.

Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. There are no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the villages and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from the proposed developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists directly as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. To wilfully add traffic load would be quite irresponsible.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street (A247) generally only has a narrow footpath on one
side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements as has happened most recently on 12th July 2016.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6136  Respondent: 15424865 / Robert Victor Ewen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Without proper planning and funding for healthcare and other facilities, local services will be overwhelmed.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no consideration of provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/863  Respondent: 15425665 / East Clandon Parish Council (Alyson Blackwell)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We note that the local road strategy allows for 30 electric car charging points, but we would suggest that this is likely to be an underestimate in the coming 20 years, given the rapid increase in acceptance and adoption of electric/hybrid cars in recent years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6218  Respondent: 15426305 / I C Dean  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICY I1 - Infrastructure and delivery

I object to this policy:

1. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of 3hrs and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problems which will be caused by the proposed scale of development. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained particularly with respect to local roads, existing congestion and public transport. The planned housing will make this far worse but CIL money cannot in general be used to address existing shortfalls but only for enabling infrastructure. The local road network has not been given sufficient consideration and bus services are being cut.

2. The Plan assumes that infrastructure is not a constraint and will be in place as needed. However this provision is critically dependent on funders and decision makers outside the Council’s control and is in no way guaranteed.

3. It is highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

4. A key element of infrastructure seems to be the so called “snake” across the town. The evidence that this will cause the benefits claimed for it is very skimpy and sections of it have not yet been shown to be feasible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1361  Respondent: 15426305 / I C Dean  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy ID1 Infrastructure – Objections

1. Even if all the infrastructure listed in App C to the Plan is provided in a timely fashion, the Plan admits “we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and also that congestion at junctions will increase (but this is not modelled so we don’t know by how much or where). Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development but to take it on faith that Highways England’s as yet unformed plans will solve the problem of the A3.

2. The cumulative effects of the developments in the north east of Guildford are certain to have a devastating impact on the A247 through West Clandon (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposals in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate this impact. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and it is well known that they have no money available.

3. Developers are now expected to fund nearly all of the infrastructure elements and planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. I question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. It is very likely that each refusal on those grounds will be appealed and it is unlikely that the courts will come down on the council’s side in all cases. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash required to provide infrastructure. Problems will have arisen before infrastructure will be put in place.

4. If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

5. The developments in the north east will draw very large amounts of additional traffic to the A247 through the village of West Clandon and there is no reference to this in the Plan. The employment sites and schools will cause considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- residents moving around the area

- children from elsewhere being delivered to Gosden Hill schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home

- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities

- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel south and returning

- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel south and returning

- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel south and returning

- private and commercial traffic originating in the south and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

- SCC’s business plan for Newlands Corner

The A247 through West Clandon is classified as an A road but it has none of the characteristics and should be downgraded. The road is a well-known problem (to Surrey Highways for example) and a number of domestic planning applications have been turned down on highways objections. It is quite unsatisfactory to even consider putting more traffic on a road that:

- is less than 2 vehicles wide in places

- does not have continuous footpaths

- has several very sharp bends

- has a hump-backed bridge with poor sight lines

- has many properties with very poor exit sight lines

- has a very difficult and dangerous junction with the station access road

- has a dangerous junction with the southbound A3 on-slip road

- is largely unlit

- has a primary school

- is already very congested at times

1. it is very clear that the developments proposed in the 2017 Local Plan will increase the amount of traffic on the A247 over and above that in the 2016 draft to which residents strongly objected. The A247 is quite unsuited to coping with additional traffic and there is nothing in the Infrastructure Schedule which addresses this issue. Indeed several of the infrastructure proposals will themselves lead to significant increases in traffic on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6208</th>
<th>Respondent: 15426337 / C Cope</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016</td>
<td>Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.

Also, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. The road surfaces are in a poor condition with many potholes. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths and are unlit at night. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites

I have serious concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and wonder that any will be put in place at all.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. I know as I live there. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I travel to work by car to Guildford most days and my journey varies in time depending on the traffic at the Duke of Wellington Pub and A246.

This is already a bottleneck and I cannot imagine what it will be like if 500 new homes are built in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16527  Respondent: 15427105 / Helen Taylorson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I travel to work by car to Guildford most days and my journey varies in time depending on the traffic at the Duke of Wellington Pub and A246.

This is already a bottleneck and I cannot imagine what it will be like if 500 new homes are built in the area.

The local schools are oversubscribed, doctors surgeries are also under immense strain and the local narrow tree lined roads were not built for the volumes suggested.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6265  Respondent: 15427617 / Ken Scotland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9. POLICY II

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow: wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever more popular past-time, particularly at weekends when hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding
the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road traffic accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring additional accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The Borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the Plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring additional accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problems, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this Policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this Plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the Plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the Borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This Plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow the needs of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to, capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision for increased capacity of Guildford's hospitals: where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6274</th>
<th>Respondent: 15427745 / Barry Nelson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan does not adequately, or at all, address the massive impact, particularly in the shorter term, the proposals would have upon - schooling, business, traffic movement and parking within the Burpham area. The proposal for a 40% increase in retail space not only goes against national and local trends but would further contribute to traffic congestion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6288</th>
<th>Respondent: 15427969 / Chris Mealing</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6294</th>
<th>Respondent: 15427969 / Chris Mealing</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6308</th>
<th>Respondent: 15428097 / Bridget McClellan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITES
1. SITES IN EAST AND WEST HORSLEY
I OBJECT to Sites A36 to 41 inclusive. They will effectively destroy these historic villages. New housing will put an intolerable strain on facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewerage and surface drainage to name but a few. The housing density is inappropriate and far greater than anywhere in the locale at present.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6310</th>
<th>Respondent: 15428097 / Bridget McClellan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOCTORS AND SCHOOLS Policy I1, Infrastructure and delivery
I OBJECT to the strain all the extra people will put on medical facilities. It is very difficult to get a doctor's appointment even now and all local schools are full to overflowing with "temporary"classrooms dotted around.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6315</th>
<th>Respondent: 15428097 / Bridget McClellan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY. Policy I1
I OBJECT, infrastructure is already hopelessly congested and cannot cope with even organic growth. The policy does not seem to mention roads and traffic which is the major cause of congestion, anyone who drives either up or down the A3 at any time of day will tell you how congested it is. Adequate infrastructure MUST be a pre condition of sustainable development. Greenfield sites present huge infrastructure problems and brownfield sites already have it in place, so it is much more sensible to use brownfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6303</th>
<th>Respondent: 15428129 / K J C Bell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The infrastructure in the area cannot withstand such high additions to housing.
Traffic gridlock and pollution are already major issues. Doctors, schools, hospitals and other amenities are already stretched to their limit. Water supply and drainage are further problems which already exist.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6318</th>
<th>Respondent: 15428225 / Vian Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians AND you have given no consideration to this point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6327</th>
<th>Respondent: 15428225 / Vian Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road &amp; Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6342  Respondent: 15428289 / Vicki Donnelly  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is mention of a distribution centre which would mean more heavy traffic and offices. There is no need for these. When those that are there now were built they stood unlet for some time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6333  Respondent: 15428897 / David Goodrick  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a retired SECAMB Paramedic who used the hospitals in and around Surrey. Over the years I have have seen these hospitals struggle against the increase in the numbers of patients being treated. Even when I retired 6 years ago, the ambulances had to wait excessive lengths of time waiting for spaces to become available in A&E, from what I am told by my colleagues who are still working, the situation has got much worse.

There is also a strain on the local GP's, with the numbers of doctors not going into General Practice, it is a situation that will only get worse over time.
There are insufficient places in local schools, any increase in demand will again only exacerbate the problem.

Our roads are even now grid locked, the traffic on A3 and M25 is often reduced to a crawl at all times of the day and obviously worse during the rush hour and school run.

The Guildford Borough Council plan to build over 14,000 houses is madness, even 10% of this figure would create problem.

The villages in around Guildford are currently delightful places to live, PLEASE DO NOT RUIN THEM, IF YOU DO, IT WILL BE YOUR LEGACY

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6336  Respondent: 15429153 / Claire Dodson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a regular commuter with a young family we moved to the area for space and to enjoy the green spaces. I am dismayed to find that the plans propose to remove Horsley from the Green Belt, ruining the villages and their surrounds. The knock on impact of additional housing is of great consequence to schools, medical facilities, parking and over crowded trains. No distinction will be discernible between Horsley and any other suburb of Greater London if this building and development work is permitted to continue on the scale proposed. Our creaking drainage systems and busy roads with well known pinch points will deteriorate further with untold consequences.

I implore you to reconsider the options available, but at all costs protect the Green Belt for generations to come.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6341  Respondent: 15429633 / Stephen Linnagar  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Having recently reviewed the proposed developments within the GBC boundaries, I feel I must object to all of the proposals due to:-

An inadequate road network that could not cope with any additional traffic.

The utilities cannot meet current demands yet alone an increase in demand for their services.

The impact of thousands of proposed properties would have a huge detrimental effect on the villages (Ockham, Send, Ripley and The Clandons in particular) affected.
The local Health Centres struggle at this time to meet demand both from trying to recruit trained staff and the demand of the current population. Additional demands would see staff moral dropping and therefore the quality of Health Services will diminish further.

I would suggest that you have received many similar objections to the proposed developments.

Therefore please reject all planning applications until at least the above concerns are rectified.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6367</th>
<th>Respondent: 15430113 / N Cook</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The M25, A3, A247 and other local roads are busy roads with daily traffic jams occurring - the roads can not take anymore traffic. The infrastructure is not in place to facilitate any more houses.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6370</th>
<th>Respondent: 15430241 / Tina Grace</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To increase a village population by over 30% without any thought to the additional strain placed on already strained local services, roads, schools/education, transport, drainage is misguided to say the least. The impact of 450 + new homes and the 900 additional cars that will add to the village roads, will seriously change the character of the village and will put local children who cycle or walking to school - something quite rightly encouraged by the local primary school- in a very position indeed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/726</th>
<th>Respondent: 15432705 / Gordon Bennett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)
We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

The Garlich Arch, Burnt common, Send & Wisley proposals will have a devastating affect on the quality of life, and pollution from the traffic it would generate, as all these developments will necessitate their traffic to be directed through Ripley. Ripley has already become a by pass for the A3, which on a daily basis has problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6478  Respondent: 15433377 / Peter Robinson  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The infrastructure of the surrounding areas and potential plans to improve these is woefully unable to support an extra 593 houses in the Horsleys over the next 5 years and most particularly when you relate this 35% increase with proposals the 2000 houses at Wisley, the 400 houses at Burnt Common and the 2000 proposed for Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8633  Respondent: 15434145 / Christine Townsend  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building on the Green Belt in any of the designated areas, including Wisley Airfield, Burnt Common and in Send.

I object to the proposed number of new houses in an area where residents experience traffic congestion every single day, where I have to drive my husband to the station at Effingham Junction as there are no parking spaces for his car by the time he leaves after 9.30am, where it already takes two or three days before a doctor's appointment is available in East Horsley, and the Waitrose car park in Cobham already has a daily queue for entry which blocks the approach road. Cobham, Ockham, the Horsleys and Ripley are already at capacity for the road and support infrastructure.

In the meantime if we choose to go to Guildford to support the Farmer's Market the traffic getting in and out is painful. Last weekend I had to complete my weekend meat order by calling in at the butcher's in Bramley. The A281 back to Guildford was solid so I went via Godalming and there was a roadworks diversion on the Charterhouse road. I sat in traffic for an hour trying to get home to Cobham. Compton was at a standstill. There are already too many people here!
I have lived in Ockham for 37 years and the quality of life has diminished here in that time along with the air quality due to the increase in traffic jams on the A3. Your local plan does not make life better for the residents who have been paying GBC Council Taxes for many years - we get less for more money.

In the meantime Guildford Town centre has great capacity for residential development in the hideous and dirty car parks around the cinema for example. I went there when the cinema in Esher was being refurbished and had the worst cinematic evening out in my life. To have a drink before the film we crossed a three lane road to the nearest hostelry on an earsplitting roundabout, and the pub floor literally squelched with spilt alcohol and stank. I was embarrassed to have brought foreign guests to the "City" of Guildford which seemed as poor and shabby as a Third World country. North Street is like Belfast in the 1970's. Spend our money on smartening up your town before you concrete over our Green Belt!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6557  Respondent: 15434209 / Brian David  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The local infrastructure is already under great strain. The schools are full and medical facilities are sorely stretched. The volume of traffic is extremely heavy and way beyond what a rural village shroud be expected to bear. The roads are totally inadequate for the volume of traffic and numbers of heavy lorries which use the B2037. Existing pavements are too narrow and pedestrians are constantly at risk from vehicles which are far too big for the local roads or from vehicles which travel much too fast through the Horsleys. There is little or no scope for expansion of the current infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6573  Respondent: 15434241 / Valerie Sowerby  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision for the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6567  Respondent: 15434273 / Brian Crosby  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our roads are narrow and congested already. More traffic will result in more congestion and render the villages and surrounding areas less safe as a consequence
**Comment ID: PSLPP16/6583  Respondent: 15434401 / Margaret Warner  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object strongly to the G.B.C. proposed new local plan.

Whilst I appreciate that there is a need for some development there is also a need to protect East Horsley village. The greenbelt is vital for this and any "exceptional circumstances" need to be clearly explained and demonstrated which is not the case. P2

Also, the area cannot cope with a new development at Wisley. Already, the roads are, at times gridlocked, the schools are full and cannot expand, the medical facilities are stretched and the shops and parking are barely adequate now and as for air quality and drainage they would only worsen.

The former Wisley Airfield should NOT be on the draft local plan and I strongly object that, after it has been thrown out by the Guildford Council, that it is still included.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/6588  Respondent: 15434433 / James Collins  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the methodology of drawing up the plan. Guildford Borough employs consultants who allegedly have planning expertise but have done so without taking account of Surrey County Council highway planners' views, or the costs involved in improving the infrastructure, currently out side their financial capability.

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as it has had no regard to schools required, additional medical or hospital facilities which would make a plan sustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: pslp171/399  Respondent: 15434433 / James Collins  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan.”

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6591  Respondent: 15434529 / Kate lloyd  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The local infrastructure is already under great strain.
The schools are full and medical facilities are sorely stretched.
The volume of traffic is extremely heavy and way beyond what a rural village shroud be expected to bear.
The roads are totally inadequate for the volume of traffic and numbers of heavy lorries which use the B2037.
Existing pavements are too narrow and pedestrians are constantly at risk from vehicles which are far too big for the local roads or from vehicles which travel much too fast through the Horsleys.
There is little or no scope for expansion of the current infrastructure
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6595  Respondent: 15434593 / Eric Mason  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have lived in West Horsley for 41 years and over that period have noticed how the area has become more crowded, this has been caused by infilling with houses resulting in car parking becoming more difficult, both Horsley and Effingham station car parks are usually full. The local schools are full. The doctors surgeries are full. The foul sewerage system cannot cope with anymore buildings in the area without upgrading which is not currently planned.

Please do not overcrowd this beautiful area.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6597  Respondent: 15434721 / Charlotte Jordan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With the large number of houses envisaged (Gosden Hill Farm - Merrow policy A25 and Garlick's Arch policy A43) the infrastructure to cope with all the new houses will never be delivered.

Volume of cars will clog the already overcrowded roads in this area for which there is no solution and will just make travelling around our borough a misery

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6605  Respondent: 15434753 / Hilary Clements  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The reason we moved to this area was due to the Green Belt area, and these additional homes will virtually make one large new town between Aldershot and Guildford. I don't believe sufficient plans have been made for infrastructure to support this increase, not only for traffic but also for vital services such as doctors and hospital. Local surgeries are already under strain with waiting times of up to 2 weeks for non urgent appointments, this can only get worse. Issues with being able to park in Ash Vale to shop already demonstrate how quickly a trouble free trip to the shops can become a nightmare as it has been impossible to park on some occasions since the opening of the Co Op in place of Budgens, there will be far greater requirements for this type of shopping, and no plans for appropriate additional shops or parking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6616  Respondent: 15434881 / M G Waugh  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposals as many of these sites do not reflect the level of infrastructure in place to support such a volume of housing, from schools to medical facilities, shops, bus services, train station parking and We have seen how many villages in the area have been blighted by the bolt on Council Estates of the post war years - dumped on village back land with no regard to the architectural merits of the development, the local amenities on offer or the employment of the proposed residents. Each site should be considered on its own i ndi vidual
merits under the existing planning regime which has been designed to protect the environment of our rural life and given its particular circumstances.

2. I object to the proposal to build 100 houses on site A39 in East Horsley as it is fundamentally flawed. The plan already recognises that the site is in a flood plain and notes that the flood risk needs to be reduced and that accordingly there is to be no greater flood risk to anywhere else. Surely by interfering with the flood plain in this location can only transfer the flood plain impact somewhere else? That may be downstream of the site or onto adjoining properties. If there is no interference with the flood plain at the site doesn’t become viable for 100 houses. The existing proposal by Cateby Land to develop 100 affordable homes here simply does not sit comfortably with any sustainable, accessible or employment rationale. It is building the wrong types of houses in the wrong place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I live in Heath View East Horsley and although for reasons best known to the boundary dept I am technically in the parish of Effingham, I am very much a Horsley person having lived and participated in the village for the past 65 years.

The planned development sites will ruin the village. The wider infrastructure of roads, drains, schools and medical facilities will be completely inadequate. These issues are only addressed by a few short sentences in the a 250+ page report giving the strong impression the council does not care about the impact and consequences on the lives of the people already in the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the inclusion of Site Policies A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch Send Marsh, Burntcommon and Ripley, A44 Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send, A45 Land at the rear of the Talbot, High Street, Ripley and A57 The Paddocks, Rose Lane, Ripley as there is insufficient local infrastructure to support an additional 507 families, (Policy I1) especially in respect of:

- Healthcare facilities
- Schools
- Policing
- Social Welfare
- Shops and restaurants
- Parking facilities
- Cycle Lanes
- Pedestrian footpaths

which would be overwhelmed,
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10675</th>
<th>Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of Site Policies A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, A43 Land at Garlick's Arch Send Marsh, Burntcommon and Ripley, A44 Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send, A45 Land at the rear of the Talbot, High Street, Ripley and A57 The Paddocks, Rose Lane, Ripley as there is already a very significant problem with parking in shopping areas locally and this would only be exacerbated by the addition of a further 507 local families. Ripley is particularly bad for parking with it often being impossible to find a free space. Send is not much better.

I object to inclusion of Site Policies A25 Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, A35 Land at former Wisley airfield Ockham, A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, A43 Land at Garlick's Arch Send Marsh, Burntcommon and Ripley, A44 Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send, A45 Land at the rear of the Talbot, High Street, Ripley, A57 The Paddocks, Rose Lane, Ripley and the numerous Site Policies in East and West Horsley as together these would add more than 5000 new homes and probably 10000 cars to an area within 3 miles of Send.

This huge increase in local car traffic, which would be bound to have a major impact on the local villages of Ripley, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Send, would significantly increase traffic congestion in the whole area to an unacceptable level.

It would also make the roads more dangerous for children going to/from school.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6764</th>
<th>Respondent: 15438753 / Peter Fairbrass</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. *The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. *The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No
development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

*I would further object on the likelihood that such development in said or similar areas would eventually lead to the necessity of added facilities, amenities and infrastructure that could only serve in the destruction of our villages, rural areas and general way of life - envied by most of the rest of the world and thereby giving us one of the strongest tourist industries (and therefore large financial income) in Europe; damaging that would damage far more than just this borough’s income!*

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6804  **Respondent:** 15439009 / Elisa Castle  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our children cannot get into their local school as it is and the doctors surgery is so full on a daily basis you have to be dead or dying to get an appointment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6808  **Respondent:** 15439393 / Elise Clements  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My objection is on the grounds that traffic in the area (particularly along the A323) is already bad particularly in rush hour, and an increase by more than 2400 houses will only worsen this congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6812  **Respondent:** 15439425 / Abigail Cruse  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

These villages are currently severely congested throughout the day and parking in villages such as Ripley is already a real problem, further development in these villages will only result in more traffic and parking problems. The Plan does not provide an adequate or achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads which in many of the villages
particularly Ripley Send and Clandon are narrow and only wide enough for one vehicle at a time. Additionally many of these narrow roads do not have pedestrian footpaths and are both totally unsuitable and extremely dangerous for pedestrians. Bringing an addition of some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley will exasperate this already congested area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6828 Respondent: 15439425 / Abigail Cruse Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough and the Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are already at or close to capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6860 Respondent: 15439585 / Bryan Handcock Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Local roads are not suitable for heavy traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6880 Respondent: 15440065 / R Miller Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure - is already at breaking point. Years of infill have left our roads at bursting point and our schools overcrowded and unable to cope.

Further pressure will result in a deterioration of local services

> Development of surrounding areas - is not the answer.
No matter which new facilities are available to large developments, our roads, shops and services will come under tremendous pressure and once lost, will be lost forever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6887  Respondent: 15440353 / Alison Boyce  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6910  Respondent: 15440609 / S Trower  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no proposed expansion of local facilities and infrastructure in line with the proposed addition to the total housing numbers. The village schools are full and there is no mention in the local plan about new schools to cater for the likely increased demand.

The roads in the Horsley’s are already very busy, very badly maintained, mostly unlit and with very poor drainage, which is in dire need of maintenance. There are blocked drains all over the village which have not been cleaned out in years – there is one in School Lane which is full of silt and has been for many years. The addition of more homes with drives and paved areas will only exacerbate the problem and result in greater water run off every time there is rain. Ripley Lane is impassable after any heavy rain, so how is more traffic in the area going to be able to use it?

The medical centre is in East Horsley and is already at capacity. There is a very limited bus service through the village on weekdays only and nothing at weekends. There is now no Newsagent or Post Office, and the only other village shop is due to close in the autumn. Existing residents must therefore use their cars to travel to East Horsley for the shops or railway station. This is without the massive increase in housing numbers planned.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6919  Respondent: 15440705 / Jane Martin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Presumably developers will be required to subsidise a long-term bus service to service the needs of these additional residents as they attempt to travel to facilities (doctors, schools, shops, workplaces) outside of the village as the infrastructure in the village cannot support them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6921  Respondent: 15440705 / Jane Martin  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The one village shop in West Horsley may close when the current owners retire. The shop is small and as such has limited stock. There is also very little parking. Other ‘shops’ in the parade are a dentist and a chiropractor, neither of which ‘useful’ on a daily basis to the vast majority of the population of the village. The old post office shop as recently been converted into housing excluding any future ‘useful’ businesses to take occupancy. Residents of West Horsley regularly use the facilities (shops, library, doctors etc.) in East Horsley. The infrastructure, including parking in East Horsley is under increasing strain with the free parking behind Station Parade regularly being close to full.

The Raleigh school serves both East and West Horsley and is full every year with a waiting list. There are already village residents each year which are unable to secure a place. Additional housing will only exacerbate this situation. There are suggestions to relocate the school to increase places but these additional places do not account for the additional housing proposed.

Horsley does not have a secondary school meaning that places are already limited in number at the closest secondary - Howard of Effingham School. Other schools are not feasible for village children due to their distance from home.

There is suggestion that Horsley Medical Centre would be expanded. However it is already in need of expansion to serve the current community as appointments are hard to book, parking is limited. Will the Royal Surrey also be expanded to accommodate the additional 13,000 homes across the borough?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6946  Respondent: 15441025 / Angela Batterbury  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We have recently moved and paid a premium to be able to live in this lovely village surrounded by beautiful country side and impressive scenery.

We have recently moved and paid a premium to be able to live in this lovely village surrounded by beautiful country side and impressive scenery.

We have recently moved and paid a premium to be able to live in this lovely village surrounded by beautiful country side and impressive scenery.

We have recently moved and paid a premium to be able to live in this lovely village surrounded by beautiful country side and impressive scenery.
At present, whenever I use the village facilities, I am just able to find a parking space in the main car park. Finding a space to park at the doctor's surgery has been impossible most times even at present.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6950  Respondent: 15441057 / Ruth Busby  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The reasons for my opposition are as follows

Concern over infrastructure, already known existing deficit

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6960  Respondent: 15441249 / Geoff Nicholson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

the doubling of a local population puts undue stress on the road system and will significantly increase pollution levels

the provision of schooling does not provide for ongoing funding - road traffic congestion will also increase against heavy school time traffic as it stands.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7028  Respondent: 15442049 / Ellouise Fassom  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
9. POLICY II

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow: wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever more popular past-time, particularly at weekends when hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road traffic accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring additional accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The Borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the Plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problems, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this Policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this Plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the Plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the Borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This Plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow the needs of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers...
outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) income. Instead of recognizing
this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of
large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing
conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns
over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if
at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been
identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing
residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to, capacity, such as the electrical network and
sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages
Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon
existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will
stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision for increased capacity of Guildford's hospitals: where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7151  Respondent: 15443137 / Andy Clements  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

My objection is on the grounds that traffic in the area (particularly along the A323) is already bad particularly in rush
hour, and an increase by more than 2400 houses will only worsen this congestion.

The reason we moved to this area was due to the Green Belt area, and these additional homes will virtually make one
large new town between Aldershot and Guildford. I don't believe sufficient plans have been made for infrastructure to
support this increase, not only for traffic but also for vital services such as doctors and hospital. Local surgeries are
already under strain with waiting times of up to 2 weeks for non urgent appointments, this can only get worse. Issues with
being able to park in Ash Vale to shop already demonstrate how quickly a trouble free trip to the shops can become a
nightmare as it has been impossible to park on some occasions since the opening of the Co Op in place of Budgens, there
will be far greater requirements for this type of shopping, and no plans for appropriate additional shops or parking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17711  Respondent: 15445665 / Jonathan Hewlett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development envisaged in the plan. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the huge scale of development envisaged in the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7198  Respondent: 15445697 / Jane Mary Hall  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford Borough Council Local Plan

This Local Plan appears to be very similar to the previous one which was described as not suitable for its purpose.

I object to the proposed Local Plan:

I cannot understand how anyone can expect residents to agree with a plan that is only half written. How can you suggest the building of hundreds of properties without detailed mention of the infrastructure. The infrastructure in East Horsley is already under great stress – full roads, full schools, full medical centre, full car parks and poor water supply and drainage. Main roads are not the total infrastructure of the community. I am particularly concerned at the proposal to build 100 houses beside the railway on Ockham Rd North. This road is already overcrowded and the new junction is very close to a small local school and near a junction leading to the station and Village Hall where only last week there was an accident writing off two cars.

The Local junior school is already oversubscribed, the site is tight and building more temporary classrooms will lead to serious overcrowding.

I OBJECT because of the lack of “total” infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7203  Respondent: 15445729 / Daren Aris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of school places for all the new proposed houses.

I OBJECT to the lack of doctors surgeries in the area that are already stretched.
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7267</th>
<th>Respondent: 15446145 / Nigel &amp; Jane Simpson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proprietary Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. We are particularly concerned about the winding narrow and dangerous route via the A247 through West Clandon which also results in vehicles using a cut through along the even narrower rural road. Ripley Road, through East Clandon from the A3. The Ripley Road is already dangerous and there are potentially many conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles, particularly as this is on the Surrey Hills cycle route. The dramatic increase in houses in the area will only exacerbate the problem and we can for-see serious consequences, possibly resulting in injury or death as a result of the increased use. We would hope that the Borough would be held to account if this occurs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14379</th>
<th>Respondent: 15446401 / Louise Yandle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proprietary Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY)

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
- No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7266  Respondent: 15446433 / Gavin knight  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

If this plan goes ahead what will happen about the local schools, they are not big enough to take on any more children, also the medical centre with more residents they will not be able to keep up with demand, why is this never considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7272  Respondent: 15446625 / Robert Moseley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Schools:

I understand that the schools in West Horsley have no spare capacity to deal with increased demand for places. The present proposals will lead to a large increase in demand for places at the local schools. How do you propose to deal with that? Is there a proposed building programme for schools in the area? I don’t believe there is. So the inevitable solution will be ‘temporary’ classrooms installed on school sites. As a former County Councillor in Warwickshire and a governor of many schools there I know from experience that ‘temporary’ classrooms have a great tendency to become permanent classrooms as the budget never seems to be able to accommodate a proper building programme for schools. This sells short the children, the teachers and parents who deserve to have satisfactory conditions in which the children are educated. I therefore object to the proposals on these grounds.

As a relatively recent newcomer to Surrey from the Midlands I have always been impressed by the environment in the County and particularly in the villages of Surrey. These proposals would alter the nature of the village and the way of life enjoyed by villagers in negative way and I object to that.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7285</th>
<th>Respondent: 15446753 / David Boyce</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I object due to the congestion that the development will cause to the local village road. (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends and hundreds of cyclists pass through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater traffic being generated from these developments, there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7286</th>
<th>Respondent: 15446753 / David Boyce</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I am not confident that the planning of the infrastructure requirements and the delivery of projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7294  **Respondent:** 15447873 / Karen Robinson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO PRESSURE ON GENERAL INFRASTRUCTURE with it now being far more difficult to get appointments at the Send Barns surgery. I had to drive down to book an appointment for my teenage daughter as when phoned at 8 am being unable to get through that would be my only option for an emergency appointment. This has never been case in the recent past. Send’s infrastructure cannot cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7312  **Respondent:** 15448001 / Ann Dowdeswell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no mention of scope to improve infrastructure which is already overloaded. Local Schools are full. Medical facilities stretched. Drainage is inadequate, roads and car parks are overloaded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7354  **Respondent:** 15448289 / Paul Miller  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The general infrastructure in Burpham is inadequate to deal with the increased housing proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7399  **Respondent:** 15448321 / Nicole Mapplebeck  **Agent:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

Roads through West Clandon are extremely busy at rush hour and peak commuter periods. The development will only result in additional traffic through these routes, posing serious threats to life and health of villagers using the pavements and paths in the village. Heavy vehicles frequently mount the curbs and pavements at speed in these areas. Traffic is so heavy Station users in Clandon can wait for more than 10 minutes to pull out in busy periods, causing massive congestion in the village.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however,
assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7401  Respondent: 15448353 / Emily Roberts  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

Roads through West Clandon are extremely busy at rush hour and peak commuter periods. The development will only result in additional traffic through these routes, posing serious threats to life and health of villagers using the pavements and paths in the village. Heavy vehicles frequently mount the curbs and pavements at speed in these areas. Traffic is so heavy Station users in Clandon can wait for more than 10 minutes to pull out in busy periods, causing massive congestion in the village.
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

 Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7402  **Respondent:** 15448385 / Edward Bates  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

Roads through West Clandon are extremely busy at rush hour and peak commuter periods. The development will only result in additional traffic through these routes, posing serious threats to life and health of villagers using the pavements and paths in the village. Heavy vehicles frequently mount the curbs and pavements at speed in these areas. Traffic is so heavy Station users in Clandon can wait for more than 10 minutes to pull out in busy periods, causing massive congestion in the village.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment.
without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

Roads through West Clandon are extremely busy at rush hour and peak commuter periods. The development will only result in additional traffic through these routes, posing serious threats to life and health of villagers using the pavements and paths in the village. Heavy vehicles frequently mount the curbs and pavements at speed in these areas. Traffic is so heavy Station users in Clandon can wait for more than 10 minutes to pull out in busy periods, causing massive congestion in the village.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Concern over infrastructure, already known existing deficit

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

It is also essential that such developers not be permitted to avoid contributing to the infrastructure levy and to affordable housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Infrastructure. We already face a significant deficit in all aspects of infrastructure. Roads are congested, GP's surgeries and schools are at more than capacity. I do not believe that Guildford town centre, in particular, can handle increased pressure in any of these areas. So infrastructure planning must precede development.

The too small gyratory with its surfeit of traffic lights needs to be done away with. I totally support the idea of an additional road crossing over the river and railway in the area of the courts, and I believe the land which would be required for this should be safeguarded in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7521  Respondent: 15449889 / Harriet Bell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7527  Respondent: 15449889 / Harriet Bell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7610  Respondent: 15450785 / Georgina Love  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

The plan will cause greater congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon. There appears not to be any plan to improve the infrastructure. The village roads are in poor condition and narrow and will be unable to sustain the volume of additional traffic. It will be unnecessarily dangerous and as a mother of two young children is a cause for serious concern.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
 Comment ID: PSLPP16/7614  Respondent: 15450785 / Georgina Love  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it and its development. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are already overstretched and this adds an additional and unnecessary burden.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

 Comment ID: PSLPP16/7662  Respondent: 15450945 / Sarah Kennedy Scott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Horsleys’ schools, roads, car parks, drainage, medical practice and local facilities are already fully stretched by existing demands. It is more than likely that additional pressure resulting from 590+ new houses could not be absorbed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

 Comment ID: PSLPP16/7677  Respondent: 15451009 / Michael Love  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
The plan will cause greater congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon. There appears not to be any plan to improve the infrastructure. The village roads are in poor condition and narrow and will be unable to sustain the volume of additional traffic. It will be unnecessarily dangerous and, as a father of two young children, this is a cause for serious concern.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

 Comment ID: PSLPP16/7680  Respondent: 15451009 / Michael Love  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it and its development. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are already overstretched and this adds an additional and unnecessary burden. There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the huge number of additional properties proposed in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7681  Respondent: 15451009 / Michael Love  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development could be completed. Highways England do not have plans to look and consider improvements to the A3 until 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) are not viable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7685  Respondent: 15451041 / Iain Bell  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7690  Respondent: 15451041 / Iain Bell  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7694  Respondent: 15451201 / I Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

There are no plans to improve medical and emergency services to cover the proposed developments.

I wish the above objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7704  Respondent: 15451457 / Camilla Bell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7705  Respondent: 15451457 / Camilla Bell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7722  Respondent: 15451713 / Gaby Attwood  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages already suffer from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on local roads.

Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, West Clandon included, already suffer from traffic congestion. Development around these villages will result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become ever popular, particularly at weekends with hundreds of cyclists passing through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements, as they often need to.

**I OBJECT** to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being significant for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send, will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is not sustainable.

There is no provision for the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/710  **Respondent:** 15451841 / Marion Marshall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy I1

**Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

On infrastructure, the revised plan proposals do not address the additional strain on infrastructure despite the overwhelming objections on this subject in response to the previous consultation. In particular the wording of Policy I1 has been amended to give the impression that provision of adequate infrastructure will be enforced. However, this is not within the gift of GBC. but, in the case of the road network, by Surrey Highways and Highways England both of whom will be influenced by budgetary constraints elsewhere within their jurisdiction. Equally traffic impact assessments will be
prepared, and paid for, by applicants and not by GBC and will therefore present a biased outcome in support of any development. I object to the inclusion of all sites other than brownfield sites on the basis that GBC will be unable to secure or enforce the provision of the requisite infrastructure provisions either by negotiation with developers or through other government agencies. Any development must be in current urban or brownfield site areas where there is already an appropriate infrastructure provision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7738  **Respondent:** 15451905 / Jonathan Withers  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services. Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18657  Respondent: 15451969 / Rosie Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested.

These narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians AND you have given no consideration to this point.

I walk my 3 children to Clandon School (along The Street in West Clandon - the A427) every day and have recently stopped doing this as the footpath is so narrow in places it is too dangerous. Lorries frequently mount the curb to pass one another with no consideration for pedestrians. Just this week (Tuesday 12th July) 2 cars collided on The Street in West Clandon and both ended up across the footpath. Fortunately noone was hurt this time. It is not safe now. Further increase in traffic will result in more accidents and certainly fatalities.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7767  Respondent: 15452033 / Ellen Jackson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The immediate shortage of suitable facilities for the increase in population alone is reason to be wary of this plan that seems ill thought out at best; but the damage this will do to our village, the environment, the birds and endangered bees; the increase in air, light and noise pollution, and the impact all this will have on our future has to be reason enough to halt the plans and reconsider.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7770  Respondent: 15452065 / Fiona Jackson  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7779</th>
<th>Respondent: 15452193 / Susan Hibbert</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current infrastructure surely couldn't support further housing and transport needs - very few of the local roads have pavements which enhances our rural aspect to the village, but will surely make the roads even more of a risk if the number of cars on the roads is increased. The few pavements that we do have are very narrow and we are often at risk of being hit by wing mirrors from lorries that pass by, as the roads are too narrow for two vehicles to pass each other and give room to pedestrians.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7796</th>
<th>Respondent: 15452385 / Alasdair Good</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford has a crying need for better infrastructure, especially regarding transport, and it is essential that this is prioritised in the plan and delivered before or absolutely in parallel with any other development.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7796</th>
<th>Respondent: 15452385 / Alasdair Good</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Impact of Additional Residential Housing and Population Increase on Local Facilities</td>
<td>I strongly disagree with the premise in the GBC Local Plan 2016 that Okham and the Horsleys are a suitable location for a large number of additional new houses. The housing numbers proposed for Guildford Borough are for 13040 homes over 15 years from 2016 to 2031. This number is too high. The number is based on a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which the council required to be amended by the Head of Planning. This amendment has not taken place and therefore the number of new builds proposed in the Draft Local Plan has no basis. I object to Guildford Council proposing a Draft Local Plan on the basis of flawed evidence.</td>
<td>As an inhabitant of West Horsley I know at first hand the existing population pressure on local facilities. The primary school in our neighbourhood (The Raleigh) is oversubscribed, in common with the local secondary school, the Howard of Effingham. The local medical centre is also filled to capacity. Residents of adjacent villages e.g., Ripley, East and West Clandon also use the centre. As a consequence, new residents to the village are known to register with alternative practices e.g., Bookham. In conclusion, the village services that currently exist in the Horsleys are already filled to capacity and do not have the facilities to accommodate the large number of new residents which would result from the increase in residential housing proposed in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of Increased Residential Population on Transport

An increase in the number of residents would result in a heavy increase in both construction related traffic and subsequent traffic arising from an increase in local population.

Most residents of the Horsleys work outside the villages. They either commute into London or Guildford by train, or travel by road to places of work and education. There are very few indigenous employment opportunities in the Horsleys. Essentially they are commuter dormitories. The residents of proposed additional housing are unlikely to be employed in the immediate vicinity of the Horsleys. They will therefore join existing commuters travelling either by road or rail. Horsley station car park is already filled to capacity, and there is no option to extend the car parking facilities for the station. The land is not available for expansion. Likewise, at Effingham Junction, there is little land to spare for additional parking facilities. I would conclude, therefore, there is limited potential for additional commuters to park at the local stations and commute by train. I might add, that Horsley station already serves as a rail hub for adjacent villages (e.g., Shere and Ripley), resulting in heavy road usage at peak commuting time. The housing development proposed in the Local Plan will increase the traffic volume through the village, resulting in additional air and noise pollution.

Key road links to the Horsleys focus on the A246, from Leatherhead to Guildford, and additional rural (narrow and winding) roads linking the villages to Ripley, Cobham and the A3/M25. The A246 currently carries a very high volume of commuter traffic at peak periods creating bottle necks and traffic congestion at both the Givons Grove roundabout on the Leatherhead bypass, and the Merrow roundabout on the outskirts of Guildford. The A3 likewise carries a heavy flow of traffic both into Guildford and north to the M25 at peak hours, with stationary traffic a frequent occurrence. The construction of additional housing in a rural area, which by its location and nature, requires inhabitants to travel predominantly by car, will exacerbate an already congested road network. This will clearly have safety implications, as more congested narrow, rural roads will result in a greater frequency of road traffic accidents and undoubted loss of life. It will also increase traffic congestion in local employment hotspots such as Guildford, and Leatherhead.

It makes much more sense to redevelop brownfield sites in Guildford and Woking to accommodate additional housing needs. This would have the advantage of providing new residents with the option of using the existing public transport network, or walking or cycling to work or school. They would also have a full range of urban facilities on their doorstep.

In conclusion, I strongly object to the new housing proposals outlined in the Draft Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14572</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454881 / Mark Fielder</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no plan to tackle the inevitable increase in traffic as a result of the developments. The local villages already suffer heavy traffic an increase in dwellings will only compound this problem.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15093</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454945 / Claire Cassar</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There has been no consideration given to the increase in traffic as a result of the proposed developments. The increase in the number of residences will further impact negatively on local villages already suffering as a consequence of heavy traffic and traffic congestion, particularly at peak times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/7904  
**Respondent:** 15455777 / Paul Jones  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

---

I object to the fact that there is little thought shown or given to the already overloaded Horsley village infrastructure—the local school is already at capacity, and trying to get an appointment at the Doctors is already a task in its self. How would these facilities cope with even more homes?

---

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/7949  
**Respondent:** 15456097 / Sheila Mellstrom  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

---

1. I object to the enormous amount of proposed housing causing huge increases in traffic, problems with finding school places for children in already over subscribed schools, problems for commuters in already over crowded trains, problems parking at the station and shops, pressure on local medical services. All these will ruin the lives of the residents of Ockham, the Horsleys and Effingham.

---

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/7956  
**Respondent:** 15456353 / Peter Farrant  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

---

This will surely lead to much greater traffic congestion, further pressure on local schools and doctors' surgeries with a population increase of this size. What about the negative impact on wildlife and quality of life in general?

---

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/7957  
**Respondent:** 15456353 / Peter Farrant  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There have already been significant housing developments over recent years that has resulted in the area being a lot more densely populated / congested than ever before that has already resulted in greater pressure on roads, schools and doctors' surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7959  Respondent: 15456385 / Steven Colborne-Baber  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Not only that, the infrastructure simply does not exist, certainly not in the Guildford Borough where roads are already inadequate, hospitals and doctors surgeries are not coping, transport systems are under severe pressure as are the schools. The plan makes no provision for putting this right, just feeble remarks suggesting each development will have to look into available possibilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7963  Respondent: 15456481 / Doreen Harris  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to any increase in the number of houses in the area as this will place an unwarranted pressure on the present infrastructure. The medical centre, schools, shops and parking areas are already full to capacity. I wish for the Horsleys to retain the village status rather than the town it will ultimately become if any of your proposals come into effect. There is no local support for this to happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18658  Respondent: 15456481 / Doreen Harris  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I further object on the grounds that the roads in the proposed areas are totally inadequate and already in a poor state of repair.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

You are ignoring all our objections. We do not wish our village lives to change. The infrastructure is not capable.

Building on this type of scale puts pressure on facilities, schools, medical centers which are all overstretched. Where money is involved, it is persuasive and services are shimped. In the past development has been gradual and on the whole well planned. Now everyone is getting on the bandwagon on infilling and developing any part of the greenbelt the council will allow, stop changing our lives and our area.

Traffic, already difficult, will increase dramatically especially where tannery lane meets the A247 junction. Which is highly restrictive. Our local roads are not designed for the increase in traffic for both the building part and then the residents once finished.

What the building of these properties in Tannery lane, Garlick Arch, Burnt Common, Wisley is proposing is the destruction of our village, our sacred greenbelt.

With the ancient woodland and our current way of life. Traffic will be increased to such an extent to be problematic. The effect of building on the flood zone always avoided will now effect local residents and its the everyday people who will suffer. By infilling in this way, the occupant will need to travel; out to work, increasing gridlock. Most houses have at least two cars per household and the majority have 4.

There is no circumstances that can warrant the destruction of our green belt and once its gone its gone, please take our objections seriously.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even...
more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8016  Respondent: 15458081 / K C Meldrum  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I 1- I object to this policy since the additional traffic generated by the proposed developments would increase traffic congestion to a level that would be totally unacceptable. The traffic is bad enough now.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/888  Respondent: 15458081 / K C Meldrum  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy ID1 – The transport aspects of the Plan cannot be regarded as sound. The Plan provides a vivid description of the conditions on the network today and the evidence is that these will be as poor, and in some cases worse, at the end of the plan period, even with the mitigation measures. The evidence provided indicates that congestion will be widespread on much of the highway network in peak periods, even with the proposed highway schemes and with the measures to encourage the use of public transport in place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8902  Respondent: 15460353 / Elizabeth Hewlett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.
There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17724  Respondent: 15460353 / Elizabeth Hewlett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development envisaged in the plan, Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.
There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the huge scale of development envisaged in the plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17359  Respondent: 15460737 / Donna Collinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This has been reviewed in detail by Richard Jarvis, a qualified civil engineer and expert in transport planning. His reports of the transport modelling and non road proposals are attached in Appendix 2. Also see comments on questions 1 to 3.
The transport infrastructure proposals are best summed up by “too little, too late”.
The Sustainable Movement Corridor is only shown as a concept. Its reliance on existing roads means its impact will need to be assessed and we do not have any indication of use. For example, will London Road traffic be deflected along Epsom Road and what will happen to queuing time at junctions for traffic that is not prioritised?
An appropriate site for a central bus interchange, so you can go in any direction from one point, has not been allocated.
There is no additional road bridge over the river and railway for our physically divided town.
We strongly welcome the Leader’s clear call that development should be contingent on infrastructure delivery and the policy that infrastructure should be available “when first needed”. However, policy I1 needs to be considered alongside
the infrastructure proposals in Site Allocation policies A24, A25, A26 and A35 184-192, 211-212 for strategic sites. These are discussed here to avoid duplication.

The following wording is of concern: “regard will be had to the delivery and timing of delivery of the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends, set out in the Infrastructure Schedule in the latest Infrastructure Delivery Plan, or otherwise alternative interventions which provide comparable mitigation.”

We believe the weak wording “have regard to”, on which this policy hinges, needs to be tightened. Also the option of alternative mitigation could be used to justify a sticking plaster approach and to kick infrastructure provision into the long grass. We refer to our letter in Appendix 4 and the positive reply from the Council leader.

We are delighted to see reference to an A3 tunnel beyond the Plan period but we are concerned that land is not safeguarded for entrances or works areas. Even for projects within the Plan, it is not clear that all requisite land has been safeguarded (eg railways stations and sustainable movement corridor).

Object: Inadequate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/2688</th>
<th>Respondent: 15460737 / Donna Collinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Policy ID1 Infrastructure and delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strengthening of conditionality in point (3) is supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8092</th>
<th>Respondent: 15461025 / Philip Masters</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of provision for adequate school places in the area and the problems that a huge housing site would create.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of provision for Doctors' Surgeries which are already overstretched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I urge you to reconsider and moderate any plans you are proposing to be in keeping with existing amenities. Development should be of moderate density and industrial space should be at Slyfield if it is needed. Please do not cause infrastructure overload. Please confirm that you have received my communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8096</td>
<td>Respondent: 15461217 / S. Gilby</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because there are few buses, people living in the new development will need to use cars to get to work. They will either drive to work or to a station. In order to get to Woking station most will need to use the A247 through Send. The A247 is already heavily used. It turns sharply over the bridge across the Wey Canal into Broadmead, which is flood meadow land. At the end of Broadmead the A247 comes to a mini roundabout where it splits the traffic into Woking in two directions. Any blockage to the road, by delivery lorries, road works, traffic lights or the frequent accidents that occur, results already in paralysis of both roads into and out of Woking, and also to traffic through Send. The road is not designed to take the current volume of traffic, let alone the huge traffic increase which will result from the development. Drivers trying to avoid the jams find that the rural roads in this area are narrow, single lane for the most part, in poor condition and have no footpaths. More houses means more dangerous and unsustainable traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8098</th>
<th>Respondent: 15461217 / S. Gilby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. The Plan does not identify infrastructure improvements sufficient to support the huge development. Local services, school places, doctors, are already stretched. There will be need for huge sewerage, water and utility provision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8105</th>
<th>Respondent: 15461409 / Laura Sawyer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therefore we should be focusing more on saving our green areas, protecting our ancient woodlands and reducing the amount of traffic that passes through our villages; not planning more building which in turn will create further need for more schools, roads and other facilities which are already in short supply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8138   Respondent: 15461633 / Anna Wood   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2002   Respondent: 15461793 / Paul Smith   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is concern about the inability of current infrastructure to meet current and future needs. The policy recognises that the “Infrastructure provider” will maintain infrastructure in more cases, and developers can only offer a contribution via Community Infrastructure Levy. Until the current infrastructure can meet existing needs adequately, further development should be very targeted to meet only absolute essentials.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8180   Respondent: 15462017 / Kevin Rhoades   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

At present the rural roads which service Ripley, Send & Clandon are narrow are in poor condition and have no footpath access. If developed with 5000 new homes, serious congestion would be incurred making the roads unsustainable for traffic.
There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8191  Respondent: 15462017 / Kevin Rhoades  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8204  Respondent: 15462241 / V.S. Thomas  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels-roads, doctors, schools will not be able to cope;

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8201  Respondent: 15462273 / Frank Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The infrastructure of the surrounding area could not cope properly with the increased population and congestion the plans would cause and as a result I personally reject these plans.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/8260</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15462785 / Thomas McMinn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages already suffer from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on local roads.

Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, West Clandon included, already suffer from traffic congestion. Development around these villages will result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become ever popular, particularly at weekends with hundreds of cyclists passing through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements, as they often need to.

10.I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1) Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being significant for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send, will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is not sustainable.

There is no provision for the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8269  Respondent: 15463713 / Tracey Broadhurst-Jones  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8273  Respondent: 15463777 / Jade Broadhurst-Jones  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8277  Respondent: 15463841 / Jessie Macdonald  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8282  Respondent: 15463873 / Ellen Macdonald  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8307  **Respondent:** 15464129 / Warren Mills  **Agent:**

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
On infrastructure, the revised plan proposals do not address the additional strain on infrastructure despite the overwhelming objections on this subject in response to the previous consultation. In particular the wording of Policy ID has been amended to give the impression that provision of adequate infrastructure will be enforced. However, this is not within the gift of GBC but, in the case of the road network, by Surrey Highways and Highways England both of whom will be influenced by budgetary constraints elsewhere within their jurisdiction. Equally traffic impact assessments will be prepared, and paid for, by applicants and not by GBC and will therefore present a biased outcome in support of any development.

I object to the inclusion of all sites other than brownfield sites on the basis that that GBC will be unable to secure or enforce the provision of the requisite infrastructure provisions either by negotiation with developers or through other government agencies. Any development must be in current urban or brownfield site areas where there is already an appropriate infrastructure provision.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8320  **Respondent:** 15464353 / Tracey Mills  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8326  **Respondent:** 15464481 / David Mills  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No
development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest

6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8343  Respondent: 15464577 / Andrew Brown  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8356  Respondent: 15464673 / Trudy Grey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will
cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) bstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8394  
**Respondent:** 15465313 / Carole Crichton-Ward  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**  
**Sound?**  
**Legally Compliant?**

1. There would be a massive increase in both industrial and private traffic. The existing roads and traffic are a nightmare now with the current flow.
2. The constant diversions & roadworks already create a huge buildup of traffic. Any extra work needed -more traffic lights, laying of electrical & gas cables, sewage pipes etc would mean increased massive hold ups for any traffic now plus the extra cars & other traffic that comes with new houses & building works.
3. The proposal means huge amounts of extra people, houses, traffic with accompanying shops, pubs, leisure facilities, public transport, new parking areas, the laying of cables, pipes, extra sewage works, refuse collection, schools, school transport, school parking areas, car parking, public lavatories, buses, doctors’ surgeries with their parking requirements etc. The existing surgery in Send is at breaking point already there is no room there for expansion.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8401  
**Respondent:** 15466113 / Tim Grey  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**  
**Sound?**  
**Legally Compliant?**

- I object to the fact that infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels – roads, doctors, schools will not be able to cope;

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8411  
**Respondent:** 15466113 / Tim Grey  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**  
**Sound?**  
**Legally Compliant?**

---
9. POLICY I1

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1.

By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8447  **Respondent:** 15466177 / D.L. + E.J. Wilkinson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY)

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for
- Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrast
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land
- No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the cou Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8431  **Respondent:** 15466209 / Janet Parry-Morris  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. Overloading local healthcare facilities.
   I object to the additional pressure on local healthcare facilities should the plan be implemented. Local health services, like the Villages Medical Centre, Send, are already over-stretched. Delays in seeing doctors and nurses would be much worse if the local plan be approved.
2. Local roads unsuitable for heavy vehicles and additional traffic

Local roads around villages like Ripley, Send, and Clandon are narrow and unsuitable for additional heavy traffic. The additional housing, industrial and warehousing elements on sites like the Garlick's Arch proposal will make the situation much worse. I object to the proposed local plan development because local roads would be unable to cope with the additional traffic.

3. Congestion on village roads and lanes

Many local villages suffer from long traffic delays and congestion. Junctions like Newark Road and Rose Lane in Ripley, and the Shell roundabout at Burnt Common often have long traffic queues, which are likely to be significantly worse should the local plan be implemented. I object to the further congestion in and around our villages the development would cause.

4. Congestion on local trunk roads

Local trunk roads such as the A3 and M25 already suffer severe congestion during the rush hour. I object to the development of sites in the vicinity of trunk roads where there are current issues with rush-hour congestion.

5. Parking issues in local villages

Parking in local villages such as Ripley is already an issue. It's frequently impossible to find parking in the village for longer than two-hour periods. I object to the proposals as further development around our villages and an increased population would make parking even more difficult.

6. Lack of infrastructure planning for proposed sites

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning of local services such as dentists, doctors and schools. The local infrastructure is already stretched, and planning for the implementation of improvements to infrastructure does not appear to have been adequately considered. This is particularly relevant to Garlick's Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9814  Respondent: 15466209 / Janet Parry-Morris  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Overloading local healthcare facilities

I object to the additional pressure on local healthcare facilities should the plan be implemented. Local health services, like the Villages Medical Centre, Send, are already over-stretched. Delays in seeing doctors and nurses would be much worse if the local plan be approved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9817  Respondent: 15466209 / Janet Parry-Morris  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Lack of infrastructure planning for proposed sites

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning of local services such as dentists, doctors and schools. The local infrastructure is already stretched, and planning for the implementation of improvements to infrastructure does not appear to have been adequately considered. This is particularly relevant to Garlick’s Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8455  Respondent: 15466337 / J.R. Lake  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed developments. The infrastructure at present is groaning under the weight it has to bear and little or no thought has been given to the further needs that will be created by this plan. Small villages have small and narrow roads which were not designed to accommodate the high volume of traffic which will undoubtedly follow if this plan were to go ahead.

I wish these comments to be seen by the inspector

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8452  Respondent: 15466369 / D J Crowley  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

PROPOSED HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

In my experience here and overseas requisite infrastructural requirements must be established before any new housing developments are undertaken. Anyone who cares to get up early enough to look at traffic congestion in this area will observe that the A3 is practically gridlocked each side of the M25 intersection at least twice per day and I would estimate that the A3 now operates at something very close to its maximum capacity. In consequence, the additional housing proposed in your plan will produce a catastrophic effect upon local traffic movements. Ripley High Street itself is extremely congested during peak periods and the proposed Wisley Airfield Housing Development will make this situation intolerable. There appears to be no provision for education facilities to serve the new developments: already Ripley children are being taken by taxi to schools as far away as Addlestone as secondary schooling in the area can no longer cope.

I could go on and on but will leave it there in the hope that the point will be taken that in addition to environmental concerns, the current infrastructure is at full capacity (or worse) and cannot possibly cope with the developments reflected in your plan.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPP16/8463</td>
<td>15467905 / C J Reina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>I have lived in Burpham since March 1988 (over 28 years) and there have been a number of new builds more recently, the Aldi store all of which have led to the over loading of the roads making communications problematic to say the least. At peak times (morning and evening), the roads are gridlocked and congestion throughout the day is apparent, particularly since Aldi opened in November 2015. Burpham Lane is used as a 'short cut' by traffic accessing the A3. With a primary school situated just off Burpham Lane and children/young mothers walking to and from the school; this creates risks and makes accidents waiting to happen even more likely. The roads around the village area of Burpham are narrow and there is no space to alter the access roads. Already Burpham is no longer the pleasant rural area it was and crossing the road on foot is positively dangerous for all ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPP16/8477</td>
<td>15468065 / Robert Medhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>How can the current health service deal with the influx of extra people without serious effects and longer waiting times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPP16/8480</td>
<td>15468097 / Allan Hempstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1) This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/8484  Respondent: 15468097 / Allan Hempstead  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8488  Respondent: 15468161 / Jane Bell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8491  Respondent: 15468161 / Jane Bell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8493  Respondent: 15468193 / Juliet Soley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There have been no sound reasons given for the proposed changes which seem to be aimed solely at increasing land available within the settlements for future additional development. The local schools are already full and if there are any spaces available it would be one or to not 1000 or more! The Medical facilities are stretched. Drainage is inadequate and roads and car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements.

without a doubt your proposed plans are going to ruin the local villages, the infrastructure on’t be able to cope and the scale of increase has alarming results (up to 35% in existing west Horsley households - greater than any other single area in the Borough).

I sincerely hope you ill reconsider your plans that are going to have a detrimental effect on the hole borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8501</th>
<th>Respondent: 15468609 / Lesley Lane</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8504</th>
<th>Respondent: 15468609 / Lesley Lane</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8507</th>
<th>Respondent: 15468673 / Claire Taylor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Ash and Tongham (policies A27 A28 A29) Normandy (policy A46)

I am writing to object to the above mentioned policies.

I live in Upper Pinewood Road Ash which is betwix both mentioned plans.

The roads in the area are already struggling to cope with traffic which in the rush hour back up in both directions. There have been accidents requiring air ambulances at Harper’s Road which is heavily used. Many houses along the Aldershot Road do not have parking with our Road an unadopted unmade road heavily used by persons not living in it causing congestion and at least 2 dumped cars are present at the moment. The rail crossing backs up heavily at peak times.

I drive a Half hour journey to and from work and the only place I get held up is five minutes from my home between the lights at the junction of the Aldershot/Pirbright Roads and my home due to traffic and the level crossing.

Our water supply struggles with low pressure and with more houses in the area I believe south east water do not have the infrastructure to supply more homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8513  Respondent: 15468801 / Lynne Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. The lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

There are no adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical, emergency and other services to cover the proposed developments.

I wish the above objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8531  Respondent: 15469249 / Daniel Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 3000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result at the development proposed under the local plan, The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43} being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8544  **Respondent:** 15470305 / E C McQuade  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I strongly object to Guildford councils plans because of the lack of infrastructure. I travel on the A3 London bound every morning and already have to allow extra time on my journey, leaving at 6.30am, to join the A3 at the Ockham Park junction due to an excessive weight of traffic for the M25 and A3. The proposal will substantially increase the number of cars to this already congested local road system.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8611  **Respondent:** 15471489 / P Gilby  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure

Because there are few buses, people living in the new development will need to use cars to get to work. They will either drive to work or to a station. In order to get to Woking station most will need to use the A247 through Send. The A247 is already heavily used. It turns sharply over the bridge across the Wey Canal into Broadmead, which is flood meadow land. At the end of Broadmead the A247 comes to a mini roundabout where it splits the traffic into Woking in two directions.

Any blockage to the road, by delivery lorries, road works, traffic lights or the frequent accidents that occur, results already in paralysis of both roads into and out of Woking, and also to traffic through Send. The road is not designed to take the current volume of traffic, let alone the huge traffic increase which will result from the development. Drivers trying to avoid the jams find that the rural roads in this area are narrow, single lane for the most part, in poor condition and have no footpaths. More houses will mean more dangerous and unsustainable traffic. It should also be noted that there is an antiquated main sewer running below the A247 which has collapsed in the past causing road closures and associated traffic chaos, any additional traffic will only increase loadings and vibration on this old sewer system leading to future blockages.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8618  **Respondent:** 15471489 / P Gilby  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. The Plan does not identify infrastructure improvements sufficient to support the huge development. Local services, school places and doctors, are already stretched. There will be need for huge sewerage, water and utility provision.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8602  Respondent: 15472097 / Bernard Eyre  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 3000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of Improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity.
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8608  Respondent: 15472705 / Mark Seager  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have real concerns and object strongly to guildford BC’s local housing plan 2016

My reasoning is this has been badly thought out. I do not think that the local infrastructure has been properly considered and am concerned that the houses will be built quickly and the roads, sewage and local environment will have secondary importance and will only be dealt with after the houses have been built and the additional populous has arrived with their increase in traffic, and the new locals’ educational needs and health issues only considered after the event.

All the proposed additional plans will not fit into the limited area without major upheaval to the current population. It takes me half an hour longer to travel to work than it did 10 years ago how much longer will it take in the future. The A3 is not just busy during rush hours filling up one way in the morning and the other way in the evening it is continuous both ways and the additional traffic will make it worse getting into Guildford at Ladymead or exiting at Burpham.

I live in Burpham and have to queue following 25-30 cars in the morning to get out of ’New Inn Lane, how much worse will it be with all the additional houses you plan to build in the vicinity.

My doctors surgery Merrow Park is full to overflowing. It takes 2 weeks to get a doctor’s appointment currently. How much longer will it take in the future until you get a new clinic, if you ever do.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8642  Respondent: 15473793 / Helen Norman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Utilities

The sewage, water and electricity systems are at capacity in Burpham and these basic systems need to updated and improved in order to take the greater demand placed on it by more households.
It is not acceptable to do this once planning permission is approved it needs to be carried out beforehand to ensure that the existing residents of Burpham are not having to accept a reduction in services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8647  Respondent: 15474785 / Jules Widdowson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Horsley village infrastructure is already over loaded. For example, the local school is over capacity, as is the Doctors. The roads through the village are already so dangerous - Ockham Road, for example, has so many lorries, vans and cars that it has become too dangerous for me to walk, scoot or cycle the children to school. I see commuters, families and elderly stuck, waiting, in people's driveways on wet days - unable to make progress along the road as they get soaked by passing vehicles driving so close to the pavement and the overloaded gutters. The knock on effect on Ripley will also be disastrous - it's already very difficult to get through to Pyrford at peak times, with queues up Ripley High Street and down Ripley Lane. Similarly, getting onto Cobham High Street, the A3 at Cobham and Ockham and the M25 at peak times is incredibly hard already, and daily I see dangerous driving as people take risks to try and speed up their journey. More homes, more families, more elderly will further stretch these services and the infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8686  Respondent: 15474849 / Timothy Yorath  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Glandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Glandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as West Glandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon...
the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough's infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan's determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services. Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I believe there are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the infrastructure of Guildford Borough as it is today and that the aggressive housing policy as proposed by GBC in the Proposed Submission Local Plan will exacerbate this problem.

I would make the following comments specifically about infrastructure in East Horsley today:

- Roads across the parish are in poor condition with many potholes. Many roads are unable to sustain their current levels of traffic, particularly the increasing levels of HGV traffic;
- The principal through roads traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. As a senior SCC councillor remarked at a recent public meeting in the village hall: “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them;
- Many of the drains are blocked or otherwise in poor condition giving rise to frequent surface water flooding when it rains;
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs;
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them, with the result that children are often allocated to schools a significant distance away such as Dorking or Woking; and
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of

It is recognised that, as stated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the maintenance of adequate infrastructure and its expansion to meet growing needs is the responsibility of the relevant infrastructure provider. This is often not GBC itself but rather, for example, Surrey County Council or utility companies.

In respect of East Horsley, there are only two specific proposals in Appendix C:

LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. It is not clear what is proposed here, and its timing and funding have to be considered uncertain. It is stated that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. However, it

is not at all clear what development is likely to give rise to such a contribution, but it certainly implies that funding could only come if there were a development; and

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan.

There are no proposals in respect of all the existing problems with for example roads, pavements, drainage, and schools.

Furthermore, it is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

Although an expansion of the Medical centre is proposed in the Infrastructure Schedule, this is not until years 5 – 15 of the Plan. Given that it is already at capacity, EHPC believes that this needs to be done earlier.

Local primary schooling is also a very pertinent issue. There are 11 housing development sites identified in the LAA for East and West Horsley, which taken together would result in the building of 593 new houses in the two parishes that are today served by a single primary school - The Raleigh, in West Horsley. Planning guidance suggest that this number of new homes will require the provision of around 150 additional primary school places to accommodate such an increase in population. Today there is no spare capacity at The Raleigh, yet no proposals are made in the Proposed Submission Local Plan to provide for any more schooling in the Horsley’s.
I believe that the failure to address the inadequacies of the existing infrastructure to meet the needs of what is there already is a serious deficiency in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I accordingly object to the infrastructure proposals on these grounds. I further object to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8732  Respondent: 15475297 / Jane Patricia Chandler  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/8739  Respondent: 15475393 / Peter Bartlett  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)**

This plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve the local situation

**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/8774  Respondent: 15476289 / Gregory Heffer  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)**

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more
congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8790  **Respondent:** 15476641 / Tessa Hart  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

The local primary school is already full and there are no additional places and building expenditure planned. There is no local secondary school and the Howard of Effingham, which is the nearest state secondary school, is at full capacity with no plans for expansion. Therefore there will be no available school places for newcomers. There is nothing in the local plan to address this issue.

Horsley Medical Centre barely manages to cope with current demands for its services. There is nothing in the local plan about expanding this provision. 533 new houses in the Horsleys will severely affect the ability of the Medical Centre to provide a satisfactory service to residents.

Including the development at Wisley, there would be upwards of 6,000 additional cars within a three mile radius of the Horsleys. Apart from the obvious impact on traffic volumes which are already high during the rush hour on the A246, Ockham Rd South and Ockham Rd North, parking will become a major issue. Both Effingham Junction and Horsley Station car parks are at full capacity and parking at the shops, the medical centre and the village hall will be under huge pressure. The local plan completely fails to take account of these issues.

Commuter trains to London from Horsley and Effingham are almost full by the time they arrive in Horsley. How will the commuters from the 2,000 new houses at Wisley and the 533 new houses in the Horsleys get to London? There is nothing in the local plan about either additional trains or additional station parking.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8795  **Respondent:** 15476673 / Josh Hart  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to the draft local plan as it will severely affect the quality of life for the residents of both East and West Horsley, including the lives of the newcomers who would be living in the additional planned houses. My objections largely focus on the apparent lack of infrastructure planning and the number of houses planned. Please see below:

The local primary school is already full and there are no additional places and building expenditure planned. There is no local secondary school and the Howard of Effingham, which is the nearest state secondary school, is at full capacity with no plans for expansion. Therefore there will be no available school places for newcomers. There is nothing in the local plan to address this issue.
Horsley Medical Centre barely manages to cope with current demands for its services. There is nothing in the local plan about expanding this provision. 533 new houses in the Horsleys will severely affect the ability of the Medical Centre to provide a satisfactory service to residents.

Including the development at Wisley, there would be upwards of 6,000 additional cars within a three mile radius of the Horsleys. Apart from the obvious impact on traffic volumes which are already high during the rush hour on the A246, Ockham Rd South and Ockham Rd North, parking will become a major issue. Both Effingham Junction and Horsley Station car parks are at full capacity and parking at the shops, the medical centre and the village hall will be under huge pressure. The local plan completely fails to take account of these issues.

Commuter trains to London from Horsley and Effingham are almost full by the time they arrive in Horsley. How will the commuters from the 2,000 new houses at Wisley and the 533 new houses in the Horsleys get to London? There is nothing in the local plan about either additional trains or additional station parking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18659  Respondent: 15476801 / Raymond and Monica Harmes  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are fortunate enough now that we are elderly to live on Ockham Road South, close to all amenities. However, although the village remains largely unchanged, the traffic situation has worsened immeasurably with many heavy lorries thundering through and more and more cars cutting through to access the A3. Should any of the proposed developments take place this could only exacerbate the problem given that most households appear to have at least 2 cars and there is little or no scope for improvement - the infrastructure is already almost at breaking point.

Ockham Road North and South is a narrow road, not constructed as a major route and with very bad drainage as any unfortunate pedestrian will attest to after heavy rain when waders are required to avoid getting splashed by passing vehicles. Accidents in the area around Station Parade are frequent with too high a volume of traffic using the Parade slip road, Kingston Avenue for the Medical Centre and Railway Station branching onto Ockham Road South. The Drift has also become a rat run for many vehicles with the benefit of Satnav and your plans would be detrimental to the woodland environment and wildlife with increased traffic.

At the weekend especially, the surrounding narrow roads are very busy with cyclists touring the Surrey Villages and motor vehicles have to share the roads with a number of horse riders too. Surely any increase in volume of traffic is highly undesirable.

The Wisley interchange on the M25 is already one of the most congested junctions. A development of 2000 homes close by is sheer madness in the circumstances and would add to traffic chaos through Ripley village and more traffic on all the small local lanes which in many cases are single track with passing places.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8801  Respondent: 15476833 / Peter Hart  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
The local primary school is already full and there are no additional places and building expenditure planned. There is no local secondary school and the Howard of Effingham, which is the nearest state secondary school, is at full capacity with no plans for expansion. Therefore there will be no available school places for newcomers. There is nothing in the local plan to address this issue.

Horsley Medical Centre barely manages to cope with current demands for its services. There is nothing in the local plan about expanding this provision. 533 new houses in the Horsleys will severely affect the ability of the Medical Centre to provide a satisfactory service to residents.

Including the development at Wisley, there would be upwards of 6,000 additional cars within a three mile radius of the Horsleys. Apart from the obvious impact on traffic volumes which are already high during the rush hour on the A246, Ockham Rd South and Ockham Rd North, parking will become a major issue. Both Effingham Junction and Horsley Station car parks are at full capacity and parking at the shops, the medical centre and the village hall will be under huge pressure. The local plan completely fails to take account of these issues.

Commuter trains to London from Horsley and Effingham are almost full by the time they arrive in Horsley. How will the commuters from the 2,000 new houses at Wisley and the 533 new houses in the Horsleys get to London? There is nothing in the local plan about either additional trains or additional station parking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8949  Respondent: 15478017 / Kirstie Pankhurst  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY)
• Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
• Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
• Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
• Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
• No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8998  Respondent: 15478177 / Michelle Brown  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates unsurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. This will increase the risk of serious accidents.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon where my parents live, already suffer from intolerable traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. As I say above, as an electric wheelchair who often visits, the danger is already substantial and would only worsen if the proposed developments were to go ahead.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network, phone and broadband and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits … “we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has even less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and /or HE do not provide timely infrastructure? It is clearly impossible to go head with the proposed developments absent guarantees that appropriate infrastructure is in place.

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:
- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

You will recall that in prior responses I explained that my wheelchair-bound disabled daughter often visits us and travels from Clandon station to our home along the A247 and that any increase in traffic ill increase the danger to her in making that journey. I see no attempt to deal with this point.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9224</th>
<th>Respondent: 15481281 / Simon Tolchard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the above policies primarily because they appear to suggest that infrastructure is not being considered as a pre-condition of development. The Local Plan does not provide confirmed plans for the improvements to infrastructure which would be required to support even a proportionate amount of new housing. Much of the local infrastructure is already inadequate or at capacity, evidenced by congested and poor-conditioned rural roads, frequent flooding issues, lack of healthcare facilities and the need for First Responders and defibrillators due to distance from accident and emergency facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is essential that infrastructure improvements are confirmed and fully funded before decisions are taken on proportionate housing development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9245</th>
<th>Respondent: 15481281 / Simon Tolchard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking is available at Effingham Junction station. Building upon the Common and allowing motor vehicles to access the common would contravene a number of Acts (1857 and 1875, the Commons Act 2006 and the Road Traffic Act 1988). Rare insect and bird life would be irrevocably damaged by development works.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Local Plan will shape the future of our historic village and our borough. Please listen to the views of the residents. I would be pleased to see a revision to the Local Plan which preserves the Green Belt and results in proportionate development on suitable sites, supported by infrastructure improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9304</th>
<th>Respondent: 15481409 / Amy F Corstin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking is available at Effingham Junction station. Building upon the Common and allowing motor vehicles to access the common would contravene a number of Acts (1857 and 1875, the Commons Act 2006 and the Road Traffic Act 1988). Rare insect and bird life would be irrevocably damaged by development works.

- The Local Plan will shape the future of our historic village and our borough. Please listen to the views of the residents. I would be pleased to see a revision to the Local Plan which preserves the Green Belt and results in proportionate development on suitable sites, supported by infrastructure improvements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9499  **Respondent:** 15482817 / C.E. Pullen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9503  **Respondent:** 15482817 / C.E. Pullen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9583</th>
<th>Respondent: 15483553 / Robert Bastable</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1) This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9586</th>
<th>Respondent: 15483553 / Robert Bastable</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1) The current and existing services are overstretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9594</th>
<th>Respondent: 15483713 / Claire Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1) This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9607</th>
<th>Respondent: 15483713 / Claire Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

** What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9622</th>
<th>Respondent: 15484033 / Caroline Ali</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

** What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9629</th>
<th>Respondent: 15484033 / Caroline Ali</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

** What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9667</th>
<th>Respondent: 15485217 / Fiona MacKenzie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- lack of specific details as to how the existing infrastructure is to be improved to cope with all the additional planned development.

** What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will have a significant impact on local infrastructure such as roads, medical facilities and schools which are already full.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road &amp; Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley which I use to access the A3 from Pyrford. Further development within Ripley which will cause this to become a bigger bottleneck for traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not believe you have fully considered the environmental impact of removing countryside from the greenbelt. The air quality of residents will deteriorate due to increased traffic and building within Ripley and Send will increase flooding risk lower down the Wey catchment. I do not believe the local sewer infrastructure will be able to handle the additional population growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly believe that the guildford area does not need this development at any cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No infrastructure to cope with the increase of traffic.

The lack of provision for new schools, doctors surgeries etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9715  Respondent: 15485473 / Eilish Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)

   There is too much traffic in the villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in the area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths; 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic. Furthermore, cycling is a popular past time within this area and brings plenty of tourism. However, with extra cars on the road, and perhaps using the rural roads, there is a probability that more cyclist deaths will occur.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9724  Respondent: 15485473 / Eilish Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy 11)

   The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

   There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9732  Respondent: 15485601 / Tim Jewers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---
1. I object to the lack of planned infrastructure for local roads, air quality, public transport and the reliance of the developer to provide this.

1. I object to the increased population numbers which will overwhelm local healthcare, policing and social welfare facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9753  Respondent: 15485825 / Eric Gunner  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The infrastructure has never been upgraded and any further developments would add pressure on this already overstretched services

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9777  Respondent: 15485985 / Jean Dunning  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the strain put on existing services, such as the police and emergency services.

I object to the lack of immediate provision of new schools and doctors surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9791  Respondent: 15486017 / Neil Higgins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to a Local Plan which does not consider the infrastructure needs required to support that Plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Lack of Utilities Capacity

The utilities won’t be able to cope

I could continue but there are so many issues with the plans that they are fundamental.

Please review them urgently

Lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites

I object to the lack of infrastructure for sites like Garlicks’ Arch. Where are the residents going to school and what GP surgery will they belong to?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The local schools are already full. The Medical facilities are stretched. Drainage is inadequate and roads and car parks are overloaded with little or no scope for improvements. Traffic around the area is generally getting heavier and the villages have not been built with such a high density of housing or population in mind.

Without a doubt your proposed plans are going to ruin the local villages, the infrastructure won’t be able to cope and the scale of increase has alarming results (up to 35% in existing west Horsley households - greater than any other single area in the Borough).

I sincerely hope you will reconsider your plans that are going to have a detrimental effect on the whole borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Without a doubt your proposed plans are going to ruin the local villages, the infrastructure won’t be able to cope and the scale of increase has alarming results (up to 35% in existing west Horsley households - greater than any other single area in the Borough).

I sincerely hope you will reconsider your plans that are going to have a detrimental effect on the whole borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I have concerns over the strain the additional proposals will place on local resources. The roads in the surrounding area will not be able to cope with the addition of some 800 vehicles of local traffic. It is also my belief that the current local surgery will be overstretched with the addition of houses proposed causing a backlash for current residents.

I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the lack of road infrastructure and the congestion that this development will cause to the local village roads (Policy I1)

These villages are currently severely congested throughout the day and parking in villages such as Ripley is already a real problem, further development in these villages will only result in more traffic and parking problems. The Plan does not provide an adequate or achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads which in many of the villages particularly Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and only wide enough for one vehicle at a time. Additionally many of these narrow roads do not have pedestrian footpaths and are both totally unsuitable and extremely dangerous for pedestrians. Bringing an addition of some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley will exasperate this already congested area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough and the Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are already at or close to capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10019  Respondent: 15495745 / David Williams  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

To build hundreds of houses in the Horsleys is out of all proportion as there is no infrastructure in place to support this. Already Raleigh School is oversubscribed as is the medical centre - impossible to get urgent appointments now. Our busy narrow potholed roads cannot cope

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10050  Respondent: 15495873 / Gerard Duvé  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure and Delivery

I object to any development without the necessary infrastructure being put in place prior to development. I object to developments not providing their planned infrastructure, i.e. schools, health centres, prior to the first properties being sold.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10121  Respondent: 15496897 / Iris Watts  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
East & West Horsley are two very different villages. Long may they remain so. Yes, we do need more houses, but the local infrastructure is already overloaded - more houses mean more people, thus more pressure on the overloaded infrastructure. More thought should be given to this problem. But it never is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/10125  **Respondent:** 15497025 / Hartley Bishop  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

My main concern is the impact that such a considerable increase in housing will have on the roads around the villages of East and West Horsley and Ockham. The roads, frequently narrow and already poorly maintained will become much more congested. Cyclists (encouraged to use the local roads by SCC and GBC) and pedestrians will surely be put at risk.

Parking is very limited at Horsley Railway Station and Bus Services are unlikely to be increased to accommodate such a large increase in population.

The proposed developments will surely place a great strain on schooling. Even if extra places can be found at local schools on their small sites there will again be problems accessing the sites.

Clearly I have not been made aware of all the detailed plans for local amenities and services. But it is impossible to believe that sewage, telephone, medical, libraries, broadband, shops and policing will be increased to a level that can sustain such a large increase in population. Indeed, many of these services have been reduced in recent years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/10199  **Respondent:** 15497505 / Jyoti Nanda  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10202  Respondent: 15497505 / Jyoti Nanda  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10185  Respondent: 15497857 / Elisabeth A Hawkey  Agent:
I object to the number of homes you propose to build will inevitably put strain on the current infra-structure including highways, schools and GP surgeries. I understand that there are not enough secondary school places for the current number of young people and GP Practices do not have the resources to expand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. As somebody with a child relying on using their bike to get around I object to this being even more dangerous! As a car driver I object to the added safety implications.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, I (and other residents) will see our quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. I use this centre when I need to, and I know it is difficult to get an appointment already. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. In recent years we have lost our local police presence and it is unrealistic to expect that will improve.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the local plan making East and West Horsley less sustainable. This is breach of para 7 and 9 NPPF and policy S1 of the proposed local plan. Failing to provide essential health, education and community facilities forces residents to use private vehicles to reach these when at present the majority can walk. The Infrastructure survey suggests that primary and junior school aged children will have to travel to Ripley and Clandon to attend school. No provision is made for any other facilities including health, dental, community and sport.

I OBJECT to the fact that the Local plan does not effectively demonstrate proposals to improve road networks to accommodate the additional vehicles likely to travel through East and West Horsley. The majority of through roads are narrow, have pinch points and are subject to closure through flooding on a regular basis.

LRN7 intends to introduce interventions to address potential highway performance issues resulting from the development of Wisley airfield. If these are those put forward by the developers they are likely to have a significant negative impact on East and West Horsley, or any traffic travelling to or through even without additional housing.

LRN22 East and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme is non specific and the suggested £1m is insufficient to make sufficient improvements to deal with the substantial traffic increase likely if all aspects of the local plan are allowed.

I OBJECT to the council failing to deliver sufficient infrastructure to cope with the proposed development within this area of the borough. The bus network is almost non-existent and new buses are linked only to the Wisley development. The train station car-parks at Horsley and Effingham junction are always full and there is no space to enlarge them. The roads are not suitable for commuters to cycle any distance due to the narrowness of the roads, speed of traffic and lack of space to build cycle paths.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough's infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan's determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CII income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure.

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough's infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan's determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council's methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough's infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council's control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11810  **Respondent:** 15502465 / Mark Bourner  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Infrastructure concerns** - Despite living in East Horsley only a short distance from the Raleigh school, my oldest son was ineligible for a place in reception, as the school was filled from a catchment less than a mile from the school. If we have an additional 600 houses, or roughly 600-1200 children, the pressure on places will be even more extreme. My other major concern is the pressure on the road system. Ockham Road south, the major thoroughfare of East Horsley is already overloaded and leads to significant queues at rush hour to get through the village and onto the A246. This leads to people taking huge risks to get onto the 246, as they are so fed up they pull out just in front of oncoming traffic. It is a major accident waiting to happen. Also, the road is so narrow that when a bus and a lorry meet on this road, it all comes to a grinding halt which results in significant congestion and pollution in the village. The plan aims to build an additional 3000 homes within a 3 mile radius of the Horsley’s and the current road system is just not able to cope with this additional load. There is no indication of how construction would occur (how many additional lorries)! Finally, our trains station car parks are already full and cannot deal with increased numbers.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/10351  **Respondent:** 15502817 / Linda Margaret Cutbush  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II).
There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are in very poor condition and have little or no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10356  Respondent: 15502817 / Linda Margaret Cutbush  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II).
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10403  Respondent: 15503457 / Patrick Lea  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II).
There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10408  Respondent: 15503457 / Patrick Lea  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>( )</th>
<th>is Sound?</th>
<th>( )</th>
<th>is Legally Compliant?</th>
<th>( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/10537  **Respondent:** 15504001 / Margaret Banks  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>( )</th>
<th>is Sound?</th>
<th>( )</th>
<th>is Legally Compliant?</th>
<th>( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road &amp; Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/10628</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15504577 / Indigo Planning Limited (Michael Wood)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submitted on behalf of Kitewood Estates Ltd

PolicyI1: Infrastructure and delivery
• As noted above, Policy I1 should take account of the PPG in acknowledging that planning obligations should not result in a development proposal becoming unviable

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10625  Respondent: 15504609 / Ian Little  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In addition I object to the proposed major development sites across the Horsleys and at Okham. This objection is based on the fact that the local infrastructure is already overloaded and any further major developments in this area would seriously affect the safety and quality of life of the current residents. The local schools are full, medical services stretched and in particular from a safety and environment point of view the local roads are totally inadequate for any potential increased traffic. The quantity and speed of traffic through Forrest Road and Ockham Road are currently a major issue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10665  Respondent: 15504801 / M A Lawrence  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Schools

There is only ONE state primary school in West Horsley and NO state secondary schools. The Raleigh School is already oversubscribed and many children living in West Horsley were NOT offered places at their local school in the last few years. There is already a problem here with a lack of places and this already needs resolving WITHOUT adding another 533 homes. How do you propose to deal with this??

Medical services

It is already difficult to get an appointment at Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, the ONLY surgery in East and West Horsley. You cannot dilute this service any more.

Drainage and Flooding

There are known sewage overflow problems in Ockham Road North and Green Lane. There will be serious capacity issues with the sewer network in the village going right through to the treatment works if the large numbers of dwellings proposed are constructed.

The amount of flooding experienced a couple of years ago meant many main roads were closed for weeks on end. We were forced to use small lanes to exit the village. By doubling the number of cars in the village, this issue will be exacerbated.
I am disappointed that, despite the many objections to your plans, you STILL continue to ignore the overwhelming feedback from local residents. It is us, the current residents, who will have to live alongside these new developments and put up with the vast increase in local traffic and demand for public transport, schools, medical facilities and parking, etc.

Your plans will have a HUGELY negative impact on our day-to-day lives.

I trust that you will finally listen and review your plans substantially.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10704  Respondent: 15504929 / William Scott  Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley.

The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Glandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. As somebody who relies on their bike to get around I object to this being even more dangerous!

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, I (and other residents) will see our quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10759  Respondent: 15505857 / Karen Hookham  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Guildford transport system is already at breaking point, and the additional cars will not ease matters.
The schools are oversubscribed.
The doctors surgeries are full.
The trains are overpopulated.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10795  Respondent: 15506241 / Penny Whitlock  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
People can suffer from depression when their view/ surroundings change. Infrastructure is not developing alongside this. We need to see plans for more schools and medical provision.
Station parking is full now. Plans?
Roads are small pot holed and inadequate for expansion and drainage is awful
We love our village and really do not want a small town!
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/10848  **Respondent:** 15506369 / Sheila Jennings-Giles  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/10814  **Respondent:** 15506561 / Stuart Harrison  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

policing. I object to the new sites because with so many new properties being proposed, can the local police force deal with the rising work load they may receive.

In conclusion I object to the proposed plans for the areas of Ripley, send and clandon as the areas just do not have the adequate infrastructure to deal with such a large number of new properties, and the families that come with it. There isn't enough schools in the area forcing any new children to the area to look further afield. Which will only add to the traffic problems in the morning. The local villages don't have the facilities to cater for all the new homes. So any families moving to the area have to travel by car to the supermarkets etc and the village roads can not handle the rise in car traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/10932  **Respondent:** 15507553 / David Lawton Garner  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.
The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10937  Respondent: 15507553 / David Lawton Garner  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11048  Respondent: 15508385 / Susan Woodman  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is a lack of specific details of essential infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2554  Respondent: 15508385 / Susan Woodman  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

You should be looking at rerouting the A3 around Guildford, even in a tunnel under Guildford. Three lanes into two lanes as currently through Guildford causes gridlock most days and when there is an accident all that traffic goes through Burpham. That is just crazy and dangerous and seriously harms our health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11059</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508961 / Abby Allen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am concerned that the infrastructure in the Horsleys (schools, medical centres, roads, car parks) are already overstretched and will not be able to handle the 500+ houses proposed for the Horsleys.</strong></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11065</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508993 / Alice Norman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The sewage, water and electricity systems are at capacity in Burpham and these basic systems need to updated and improved in order to take the greater demand placed on it by more households.</strong></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11089</th>
<th>Respondent: 15509057 / Richard Golding</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure and delivery I2 Supporting the D.O.T. “Road Investment Strategy”</strong></td>
<td><strong>I OBJECT. Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services. The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment Public Transport in the form of buses are being cut bus operators require a profit or subsidy to run a service and the council s are withdrawing the subsidy so the service is withdrawn. The chance of getting new stations on the rail network is very remote they cost an out of this world figure and slow the overall service down. The dwell time of modern stock at stations is high due to the time it takes to open and close the doors. Most of the proposed improvements to the major roads will take year’s take Send at the moment the A247 Send Road comes to a standstill during the peak period adding a minimum of 480 houses which will be around 960 cars to the roads will cause grid lock this excludes the the HGV to the industrial units. Most people will use private cars as they are always have a time deficiency and buses are always slow and never there when they should be. Surrey is the most congested county in</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
England with 683, people per square kilometer compared to an average of 413. With massive disruption during construction and a huge increase in the number of cars on the local roads, gridlock awaits?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1144  **Respondent:** 15569377 / Catherine Hunter  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the lack of immediate provision for new schools

I OBJECT TO the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15965  **Respondent:** 15569377 / Catherine Hunter  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the lack of immediate provision for new schools

I OBJECT TO the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11167  **Respondent:** 15569569 / Sethulekshmy Nair  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The need for Infrastructure

Even with a much smaller percentage increase in housing major issues need to be incorporated into the a plan; underinvested public transport, gridlock at certain point at peak times, crumbling roads (without heavy construction lorries thundering down them), schools at capacity, struggling medical services, and even simple things like a needing to add footpaths (for which there is no space) or to add crossings that are currently not needed. The plan does not seem sustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Policy I1 - Infrastructure and Delivery

I object to any development without the necessary infrastructure being put in place prior to development. I object to developments not providing their planned infrastructure, i.e. schools, health centres, prior to the first properties being sold.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Policy I1 - Infrastructure and Delivery

I object to any development without the necessary infrastructure being put in place prior to development. I object to developments not providing their planned infrastructure, i.e. schools, health centres, prior to the first properties being sold.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/11269  Respondent: 15570273 / Barnaby Geib  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11295  Respondent: 15570305 / Richard Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11303  Respondent: 15570305 / Richard Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15308  Respondent: 15570817 / Tom Edelsten  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15310  Respondent: 15571201 / Zoe Dudgeon  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11464  Respondent: 15571425 / Monika Neczaj  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY)

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
- No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11491  Respondent: 15571553 / Darren Carbine  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I1 - Infrastructure and delivery - I OBJECT.

Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. However, this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for. The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment, not a good or clever idea. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11511  Respondent: 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites - Policy

- Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the relatively few projects identified will be implemented in advance of, or at the very latest, concurrently with the developments.
- I have a concern that budget constraints, often outside the control of Guildford Borough, may well cause infrastructure to be seriously delayed or not even built at
• Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being shown as a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

• Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
• Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send, the Merrow Park Practice and the East Horsley Medical Centre, will have their services stretched and Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
• Police services are seeing funding The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
• There is no provision for increased capacity of Guildford hospital - where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11788  Respondent: 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I1 - Infrastructure and delivery

I object to this policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the Plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the villages of Ripley, Send and West Clandon, the roads serving the villages will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends when hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on their way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the villages and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury to the public. In the case of West Clandon, the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one (alternating) side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements as some have to do in places in order to pass.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this Plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the Plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local Plan should first assess the borough’s
infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This Plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. Implementation is critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and Community Infrastructure Levy income. This should be recognized as a key constraint but is not adequately taken into account. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as many local doctors’ surgeries will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity with waiting times of 2 weeks to see a GP. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services. There is no provision for increasing the capacity of the Royal Surrey County Hospital, Guildford. Where is this to be assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11795   Respondent: 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt   Agent:
Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the remotely adequate plans for services and infrastructure and I object to the very severe impact that the proposed plans will have on the quality of life on the existing residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2626   Respondent: 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt   Agent:
Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object that the Plan does not consider the overall and cumulative implications for the A247 of the large number of revised developments which have the potential to generate traffic on it, namely Gosden Hill, Slyfield, Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common Industrial, Wisley and interchange changes at Burnt Common. This list should also include Surrey CC plans for the development of Newlands Corner but these don’t even appear in the revised Plan, despite the fact they are currently progressing through the planning process.

The A247, although historically classified as an A road, is already deficient in many respects having less than 2 vehicle width in places, no continuous footpaths, sharp bends, a hump-backed bridge with poor sight lines, dangerous junctions with the Station access and with the A3 southbound access slip-road and a primary school located in one of the narrowest parts.

In summary, the A247 is currently unsuitable for the current levels of traffic and quite clearly cannot cope with the additional traffic. It is very clear that the developments proposed in the 2017 Local Plan will increase the amount of traffic on this road over and above that in the 2016 draft to which residents strongly objected.. Despite the previous objections, there is still nothing in the Infrastructure Schedule which addresses this issue. Indeed several of the infrastructure proposals will themselves lead to significant increases in traffic on the A247. I object that this deficiency
makes many of the above proposed development unsustainable.

I object regarding policies ID1 and ID2 (Infrastructure)

Although much more is made in the revised plan about the need for new infrastructure to support the various developments and for this to be in place when needed, little real detail is provided as to what will be done and how it will be funded.

The Plan admits “…we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes…” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion.

GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed. In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers. I question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete.

Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects. If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

I object that residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11524  Respondent: 15571681 / Anne Martin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11534  Respondent: 15571745 / Hazel Thompson  Agent:
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time such as Polesden Lane. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11535  Respondent: 15571745 / Hazel Thompson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being proposed as a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways and there will be inadequate infrastructure for the residents in the proposed housing.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Ripley and Send schools are now also at full capacity and would require expansion or additional schools being built. There is also no secondary schooling available for children of Ripley, Send and Clandon without sizable commutes by car due to lack of bus service provisions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11585  Respondent: 15571937 / S Bennell  Agent:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11608  Respondent: 15572225 / Rob White  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Local Plan:

1. The infrastructure needs to support the local plan do not appear to exist.
   1. How can you add all these houses without having the road, school, surgeries, dental practices and hospital capacity to support the added load?
   2. It already takes me an hour (or more) to get to the Royal Surrey from Merrow for appointments if at the wrong time of day and during term time, it can take up to 30 minutes just to get to the Spectrum.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11614  Respondent: 15572353 / Dianne Kashel  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A huge increase in population will put great pressure on existing services including education, medical care and sewage disposal. Doctor’s appointments are already difficult to come by unless it’s an emergency and school places are no
longer readily available for local families. We only need one sustained downpour for roads to be flooded and the Thames water crews to be out.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11619  **Respondent:** 15572641 / Susan Palmer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and West Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a hugely popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. **I OBJECT** to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied.

1. **I OBJECT** to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

Again the infrastructure required does not seem to have been addressed in the plan.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants. The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
**Air quality:** The air quality figures are based on an unreliable transport assessment.

- The applicant has not used the DEFRA modelling statistics as required and rather appears to have used numbers from an unrecognised (and unreliable source)
- Poor air quality is exacerbated in the area by temperature inversions which trap the air. Young and old are extremely susceptible to poor air quality.
- Air quality is not improving as fast as expected, partly due to the excessive emissions (VW et al)
- The impact of poor air quality on RHS Gardens at Wisley and the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA) is already in excess of legal limits.
- The Medical facilities in the area are already over stretched and adding more people whose lives and health are likely to be impaired by pollution will add to the inadequacies that already exist and create more problems for residents.
- The current NHS waiting lists and A&E waiting times at the Royal Surrey will be made even worse by adding to the population and creating a situation where there will be more cars on the A3 and M25 and narrow local roads.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Transport:** The transport assessment makes a number of erroneous assumptions and is not credible.

- It is completely unrealistic to assume that there will be a decrease in vehicle movements.
- There is no impact on traffic for the recently added secondary school, nor from the fact that prior to the school being built the children will have to be transported to the nearest available school in Leatherhead – adding to congestion.
- There appears to be no impact shown for the 270 daily bus movements or for the waste lorries or HGV deliveries to the site.
- The TRICS data used for comparison is not a relevant measure: site not comparable with a site in Guildford, nor a site 400m from the centre of Redhill, nor one on the edge of Staines.
- The traffic counts bear no relation whatsoever with counts submitted to Guildford or to Woking borough councils in support of other large development projects.
- The modelling in the Transport Assessment at 7 junctions close to the site bear no relationship to the daily experience of residents, evidencing flawed modelling.
- The number of daily trips is understated in the region of 1000 vehicle movements.
- Additional traffic will have a negative impact and cause irreparable damage to historic houses and other buildings in Ockham/Ripley/Downside and further afield.
- If allowed, the impact of the additional traffic may prohibit other developments further south on the A3 or indeed those needed by the RHS.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Impact on the local area: The additional 5,000 residents is the equivalent of almost doubling the population of East and West Horsley combined. This increase in local population will impact:

- Light pollution, noise, traffic and infrastructure which has been gravely underestimated and proposed mitigation measures are totally inadequate
- The cumulative development in the borough and in the neighbouring boroughs of Woking, Waverley and Elmbridge per the objections from both Elmbridge Borough Council and Woking BC
- The water table and flooding in the area. It appears that no impact assessment has been done relating to the loss of agricultural land which currently soaks up a significant volume of rainwater.
- Listed buildings adjacent to it such as Yarne, Bridge End House and Upton Farm
- Via closure of a number of local roads coupled with an increase in traffic will affect a large number of road users from Cranleigh to Cobham and everywhere in between

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. There is the local school with young children walking along the road on a Monday to Friday basis, which is dangerous with the current level of traffic prior to any increased traffic that would result from further housing on the proposed scale.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied? In summary the health and safety of existing communities are detrimentally impacted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11841   Respondent: 15575009 / Tony Redknap   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. There is the local school with young children walking along the road on a Monday to Friday basis, which is dangerous with the current level of traffic prior to any increased traffic that would result from further housing on the proposed scale.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied? In summary the health and safety of existing communities are detrimentally impacted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11878</th>
<th>Respondent: 15575713 / Sophie Killingley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate that new houses need to be built. However, the village of Send is not the ideal place for these houses, given the strains on the infrastructure that already exist. It will only make problems worse. I urge that proper consideration be given to whether these plans have really been thought through with the best interests of the community at heart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11908</th>
<th>Respondent: 15576865 / Mark Phinn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of any immediate provision for the doctors surgeries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11919</th>
<th>Respondent: 15577377 / Rachael Hall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local schools are over-subscribed (and were already oversubscribed when I attended them myself 10 years ago). The doctors surgery is stretched to its limits. The roads are far too busy, with many cars avoiding the motorways and using the village as a bypass. The council is not repairing pot holes that are dangerous - these would only get worse with increasing the numbers of houses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11937</th>
<th>Respondent: 15577793 / Susan Hughes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposal for the number of houses is disproportionate to the services we can provide – even with the few additional services the plan references.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12002  Respondent: 15578753 / Andrew Needham  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Sewage and water provision risks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12022  Respondent: 15578977 / Norman Evans  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The 2016 Plan is completely unacceptable. The Council has totally ignored the comments and suggestions of residents and proceeded with an outrageous assault on the Green Belt for which they have absolutely no mandate - in fact, the very opposite. The housing target is excessive and needs to be seriously reviewed, especially in light of Brexit, and a new plan needs to emerge based on actual housing needs with the right kind of accommodation in the right places, and a plan that requires the least amount of infrastructure developments. If the current Plan proceeds, it will lead to massively increased traffic congestion and pollution levels, require a huge amount of public expenditure, and destroy the character and beauty of an attractive and much-loved area.

Above all, we need a Plan that supports local needs and not the balance sheets of developers

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12032  Respondent: 15579137 / Nicodemus Brian Rhyner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12037</th>
<th>Respondent: 15579137 / Nicodemus Brian Rhyner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12053</th>
<th>Respondent: 15579361 / Caroline May</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road &amp; Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12055  Respondent: 15579361 / Caroline May  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18728  Respondent: 15579457 / RSPB South East Office (Heather Richards)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

To which section of the plan (paragraph/policy/map/table) does this comment relate?

Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery

Do you consider this section of the plan is legally compliant? Yes

Do you consider this section of the plan is sound? Yes

Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to cooperate? Yes
RSPB Comment:

The RSPB welcomes the clear commitment within the policy to prioritise CIL expenditure on the delivery of mitigation and avoidance measures for the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Since the introduction of CIL the former clear link between individual developments and the provision of SANG along with the “ring fencing” that was provided by the section 106 mechanism has been lost. This statement should help to provide legal certainty as to the delivery of this mitigation measure that is required by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended). However, the RSPB notes that whilst the legal obligation is clearly stated, the Plan does not currently make clear the long-term benefits that pursuing this policy will have for the Borough.

What changes do you suggest should be made to the document?

To address the concern we highlighted above, the RSPB recommends the provision of some additional text which explains clearly what SANG are, and explaining why it is being prioritised over other infrastructure. It would be particularly beneficial to highlight what proportion of the “over 250ha” of new accessible public open space across the borough (referred to on page 21 of the Plan) is being provided by this contribution. On the RSPB’s calculations if mitigation is to be delivered on the basis of 8ha per 1,000 new residents, with an average of 2.3 residents per new dwelling a total of 255ha of SANG will be delivered over the Plan period. Making an explicit link is likely to make the prioritisation of CIL expenditure more publicly acceptable.

If you are proposing a change to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites, do you wish to express an interest in participating at the Examination? No.

Why do you wish to participate at the Examination?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12085    Respondent: 15579489 / Ben Palmer    Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a hugely popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the
village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12087  Respondent: 15579489 / Ben Palmer  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12109  Respondent: 15579649 / Peter E May  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9.  I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ()

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12127</th>
<th>Respondent: 15579969 / Candice Carrington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lack of specific details of essential infrastructure, especially as there is an acknowledged existing deficit – How will all this be funded?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12221  Respondent: 15581665 / Laura Daboo  Agent: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ()

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road &amp; Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. This will increase the risk of serious accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon where I live, already suffer from intolerable traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network, phone and broadband and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital; where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. This will increase the risk of serious accidents.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon where I live, already suffer from intolerable traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure
requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network, phone and broadband and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital; where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12268  Respondent: 15582017 / Valerie Lewis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the pressure the developments in the Ripley and Send area will place on the local shared medical centre, and on the schools which have no capacity for further pupils.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12345  Respondent: 15582593 / Dermot McMullan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will
cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public.

This policy as it is, is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12370  Respondent: 15582913 / Nigel Pink  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the lack of Doctors Surgeries to cope with increased residents

HOW WILL THE ROYAL SURREY COPE WITH THOUSANDS MORE PATIENTS

WHERE WILL THEY PARK?

THATS IF THEY EVEN ARRIVE IN TIME FOR THEIR APPOINTMENT DUE TO

SUCH CONGESTION AROUND THE CATHEDRAL EXIT ON THE A3

I OBJECT TO lack of schools to cope with more residents.

WHERE IS THE SPACE!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12410  Respondent: 15583169 / Poul Jensen  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

** What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? **

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12414  Respondent: 15583201 / M.J Ryan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In addition, little or no provision has been made to improve the transport infrastructure in circumstances where our local roads and the A3 are already hugely congested and expensive public transport is neither reliable nor adequate. It is reasonable to assume that 13,000 extra homes will generate at least 20,000 extra cars leading to increased pollution.

** What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? **

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12449  Respondent: 15583585 / Josephine Rooke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

** What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? **
**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the lack of Doctors Surgeries to cope with increased residents

HOW WILL THE ROYAL SURREY COPE WITH THOUSANDS MORE PATIENTS

WHERE WILL THEY PARK ?????

THATS IF THEY EVEN ARRIVE IN TIME FOR THEIR APPOINTMENT DUE TO SUCH CONGESTION AROUND THE CATHEDRAL EXIT ON THE A3

I OBJECT TO lack of schools to cope with more residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12496  Respondent: 15583809 / Nigel Stephenson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)  
   There is far too much traffic in our villages now and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

   The rural roads in this area are for the most part narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12505  Respondent: 15583809 / Nigel Stephenson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)  
   The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

   There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Schools:** Schools in West Horsley are full every year, and this has been the situation for many years.

Secondary school places are limited in number at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools involve a much longer journey of time and distance from the village to reach them. Glensk and Cranmore private schools are well supported by many families living in Guildford and other villages up to 14 miles away. Each of these private schools during term time, receives high volumes of traffic going to and from each school at each end of the school day, on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively, leading to severe congestion on these and surrounding roads.

If a further 385 homes are built in West Horsley, the children in East Horsley will never find a place locally, and as suggested by SCC, children even in our own village will need to fill places in Clandon and Ripley. There is simply not enough school places available locally to meet the needs of our village, and we cannot rely on a new school at Wisley, as this is site has been refused outline planning consent on over 14 separate counts by GBC, so is a long way off from being realised, if ever.

There is no new provision made within the Draft Local Plan and its supporting evidence to address this, which as a parent I find totally unacceptable.

**Medical facilities:** It is already extremely difficult to get an appointment at the Doctor’s surgery, let alone be able to park in the limited number of spaces available (approx. 10 spaces). The doctors are working flat out, have tried to accommodate residents by opening at different times, and are doing all that they can. But with the level of development proposed they will no longer be able to operate effectively and we will see more and more people having to attend the Royal Surrey and Woking Hospitals walk in clinics. What plans to expand these hospitals have been put forward by GBC? None.

**Other facilities:** There is one small grocery store at the southern end West Horsley, which will close later this year due to retirement of the owner. Many people use the shops and library in East Horsley that has been designated in the plan as a ‘District Centre’. This is a complete misreading of the facilities in the village centre. Parking has already become increasingly difficult and these facilities will be woefully inadequate to support the proposed increase in population. It is worth considering that if every new house has 2 cars, this will mean potentially 6000 more cars within a three mile radius of the Horsley Villages. This will have a severe impact on our local roads. This increased volume of traffic will also lead to an increase in pollution, notable in nitrogen dioxide particles being released into the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas within the Borough, which GBC are failing to monitor!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
established trees along its length. Indeed it is currently suffering from severe subsidence in many places so you have to be extremely careful when driving along this road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12511  Respondent: 15583841 / Catherine Young  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Waste Water Infrastructure: This is inadequate in West Horsley and the surrounding area, with frequent flooding of gardens and roads. You have only to look at the GBC Surface Water management Plan, 2014 to see how terribly the Horsley’s are affected. The map within this document clearly illustrates that the Horsley’s are the largest area within the Borough to be called a surface flooding ‘Hot Spot’. However, no provision is made within the Draft Local Plan to address this, and this area is not even mentioned as a cause for concern – why is this? Surely GBC has a responsibility to direct development away from areas affected by flooding, and also to protect the natural flood plain?

In addition, Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough Council that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advises ‘a 2 to 3 years lead-in period’ to install the necessary wastewater network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12522  Respondent: 15584001 / Lorna Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/532  Respondent: 15584033 / Andrew Hutton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Infrastructure**

I object to most of GBC’s plans as they have proposed no realistic infrastructure improvements.

The A3/M25 interchange will cause even more air pollution than already exists, which is well above permitted levels for development.

It will swallow up huge amounts of common land.

It will direct Wisley Garden traffic onto an already over-used junction (Ripley/East Horsley), which, it is suggested will also be the exit and entrance point for the proposed development of Three Farms Meadows, (erroneously re-named Wisley airfield).

The congestion will result in tailbacks even further West in a London-bound direction, along the A3, than there are at present. (often 2 miles before the A3/M25 junction)

Ripley is threatened with ALL the traffic from Wisley, heading West on the A3, going through the village, which was by-passed in order to reduce the traffic.

I object to the plans to close roads around Wisley or to make some one way only. This will be very disruptive to traffic from other places trying to get through Ripley, or on to the A3 or from Ockham to Cobham.

A3: There are no proposals for meaningful improvements to the A3 around Guildford. At present one may be stuck in heavy traffic for 45 minutes on a daily basis, as one covers no more than 2 miles travelling Westwards. A tunnel might help but is there any realistic prospect of that being completed in the Plan period?

Roads: There are no proposals to widen or improve the surface of poor roads in and around Guildford. Many roads cannot be widened, therefore the increased traffic from the planned 12,426 new houses (approximately 24,000 extra cars) will cause grid-locks and serious congestion, within the town and in the small rural roads in and around villages.

Surgeries: There are no proposals for new surgeries in most of the areas GBC proposes to develop.

At present, most surgeries are managing at the limit of their capabilities. Many surgeries have no room to expand, even if they could find sufficient doctors, nor to expand their car-parks.

Schools: Most schools are at full capacity. Not enough new schools have been proposed.

Water and sewage: Many of the sites proposed will have difficulty in bringing in sufficient water supplies. New sewage farms would need to be built at most of the sites. At Wisley, proposals suggest that the Ripley sewage works could accommodate the waste from an extra 2000 houses. It cannot.

Trains: a new station at Burpham is a good idea. It might take the pressure off Horsley and Effingham.

Buses: Suggestions by the Wisley developers that buses might run every 10 minutes to Woking station are ludicrous. It is also unrealistic to run buses to Effingham as the road is too narrow and unsafe.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the congestion that the development will cause to local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure in the Local Plan. The local roads in the centre of Ripley and Send are completely overloaded as it is. The proposed development will cause even greater congestion and this Plan does not provide provision for improving the roads. Side roads are single or narrow track, poor quality with no pavements so are not suitable for increased traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12563  Respondent: 15584161 / Alexandra Elson  Agent:

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12644  Respondent: 15584833 / Maria Fort  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12659  Respondent: 15584961 / Helen Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I1

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1) Many villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time with road surfaces are in a very poor condition. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around many villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village and neighbouring villages will become even more congested. Every week thousands of cyclists pass through these villages following the promotion of the area in the 2012 Olympic cycle road trials. The narrow rural roads do not have cycle lanes or even proper pedestrian footpaths. In West Clandon much of the length of The Street has a narrow footpath on only one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure, as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure
capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income instead of recognising this as a key constraint.

It is highly likely that developers faced with large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development unviable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I am concerned about the lack of planning for infrastructure requirements and whether the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate as utilities and services, such as the electrical network, sewers, Doctors’ Practice and Police, in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity. The lack of plans to improve these services should be bar to development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12728</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585441 / Laurie Will</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

10. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12791  Respondent: 15585793 / Mark Horigan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12798  Respondent: 15585793 / Mark Horigan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/683  Respondent: 15585793 / Mark Horigan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:
"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan."

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12953  Respondent: 15586017 / C Maslin  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I1 INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY

I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery.

Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem.

The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.

This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a
key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable.

The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints.

The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model.

Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods.

Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan.

The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network.

It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below.

In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5...indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton.

The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have ‘an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF’.

Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided.
The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR:

Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road /Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3).

Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8).

Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14).

Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction.

Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction).

Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane.

Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12892  **Respondent:** 15587105 / John Downes  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

- I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12893</th>
<th>Respondent: 15587105 / John Downes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12887</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15587137 / John Oliver</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guildford desperately needs a local plan which meets a vision of, amongst other things, providing much-needed, additional housing and the infrastructure to cope with the consequent increased demand, not only from within the borough but from outside. The plan is also an opportunity to restructure the transport element of the town’s infrastructure in a way that efficiently meets current and future needs.

I do not underestimate the task that this represents and would like to be able to support the proposed Submission Plan. However, I find that omissions of information, lack of firm commitment to, or clarity about, particular infrastructure issues and a fundamental shift towards the reshaping of our town mean that I cannot do so.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12907</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15587137 / John Oliver</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy I1

The need to meet the infrastructure demands of the present and the future, in terms of any Plan submitted to the Secretary of State, are critical. The Plan does not give sufficient assurances that the water, sewage, electricity, roads, medical and teaching needs will be met. For example, unless a four-way interchange is developed just north of Potters Lane on the A3, Burpham will reach crisis point in terms of congestion. Congestion equals pollution, i.e. reduced air quality. Air quality will also be an important issue for any development at Gosden Hill and needs to be properly assessed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12908</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15587137 / John Oliver</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy I1
The need to meet the infrastructure demands of the present and the future, in terms of any Plan submitted to the Secretary of State, are critical. The Plan does not give sufficient assurances that the water, sewage, electricity, roads, medical and teaching needs will be met. For example, unless a four-way interchange is developed just north of Potters Lane on the A3, Burpham will reach crisis point in terms of congestion. Congestion equals pollution, i.e. reduced air quality. Air quality will also be an important issue for any development at Gosden Hill and needs to be properly assessed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12985  Respondent: 15587233 / Jane Clark  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12994  Respondent: 15587233 / Jane Clark  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13023  Respondent: 15587361 / Aileen Creegan  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital; where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy II)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

There is no detail about improvements in infrastructure. The ill-advised Aldi development further compromised inadequate infrastructure in Burpham (queues of traffic on the main London road mid-week and outside rush hour). Roads which are lanes (Burpham Lane, New Inn Lane etc) were never intended to support the volume of traffic they carry at present. Further development of this area, without addressing the infrastructure deficit, will exacerbate the existing problems and bring gridlock to our neighbourhood.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Infrastructure

Over the last 30 years, Burpham has seen 2 large housing developments and one major supermarket built, with adequate car parking.

The recent addition of the Aldi supermarket, with a car park entrance in a residential lane, has exacerbated the congestion in this area.

Our present roads are incapable of supporting more traffic which would be generated by i) the proposed housing development at Gosden Hill, and ii) the two-way proposed junction at the A3.

In conclusion, the plan is no more credible than the last, with only unsupported minor changes to the housing need figures, and no consideration for the inadequate infrastructure in the area to support the plan. I write to formally register my objection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13174  **Respondent:** 15588801 / Elizabeth Adams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Policies 11, 12 and 13**

There are serious deficiencies and shortcomings in the current infrastructure of East and West Horsley. This includes schools, roads, medical facilities. There have been complaints made to both county and local councils and it is a common subject on the local social media site.

GBC’s proposed housing policy in the Local Plan (see my comments on Policy S1 above) can only make this problem worse.

Specific current problems are:

- Potholed roads.
- The principal through roads are narrow with a number of pinch points where it is difficult for vehicles to pass one another. This is exacerbated by the increasing numbers of large vehicles such as HGVs using them.
- The principal roads struggle to cope with current levels of traffic at times. particularly:
- The roads are used by schoolchildren to cycle to & from school. Any increase in traffic volumes without improvement in the infrastructure will increasingly put them at risk.
- The pavements are in poor condition. As well as being narrow, they are often uneven and/or cracked making it difficult, for example, for people with pushchairs or prams or in wheelchairs. Once again schoolchildren walk along these narrow pavements and as for cycling above they will be in increased danger.
- There are also sections with no or narrow pavements and which are poorly lit.
- Drainage is in poor condition with blocked drains giving rise to streams of water running down the roads and frequent surface water flooding when it rains.
- There are insufficient school spaces for the number of local children needing them.
- The Medical Centre in East Horsley is already at capacity in terms of its number of patients.

Regarding East Horsley I could find only two specific proposals in Appendix C:
LRN 25 - East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme. This says that funding will, at least in part, come from developer contribution. Funding is needed now to sort out the current problems. Any words about future funds from as yet to be agreed developments is, quite frankly, pie in the sky.

HSC 5 - Expansion of East Horsley Medical Centre to provide additional capacity and services for future population in years 5 – 15 of the plan. The centre is already at capacity. There are a large number of retired & elderly people in The Horsleys. Therefore this problem will only get worse. Expansion is therefore needed now!

Local primary schooling is also a major issue. There is only one primary school in The Horsleys which is, I believe, operating at or near capacity. East Horsley Parish Council has raised this with you in its objections. The developments proposed in the plan will increase the number of children in the area but there is no provision for any more schooling in The Horsleys.

The proposed developments in The Horsleys and Wisley will put further strain on the other parts of the existing infrastructure, increasing traffic, patient numbers, and so on. Thus existing problems will be exacerbated. There are no proposals to solve these or at least to improve the situation.

I OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals as they fail to address the existing problems with the infrastructure.

I OBJECT to the infrastructure proposals because they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments set out in the Site Policies.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13199  Respondent: 15588897 / John Attridge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is already too much traffic in our villages. At present the morning traffic can back up the Portsmouth Road for over a mile from the centre of Ripley Village, simply because a school bus is trying to turn left into Newark Priory Avenue. This then has a knock on effect of tail backs down Send Marsh Road as far as the Saddler’s Arms and beyond. Further, congestion on the A3 often causes drivers to use the Portsmouth Road as a ‘rat run’, resulting in additional tail backs. The proposed housing plan for this area could put at least another 5000 cars on the road in the morning, which is simply not sustainable. Without adequate plans for improving road and transport infrastructure, the area is simply going to become gridlocked.

The A3 and M25 need to be improved before any development is considered. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. The recent opening of the Hindhead Tunnel on the A3 has noticeably increased the flow of traffic in this area, which now daily backs up from the M25 towards Guildford. So the area is already highly congested. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place until they are.

1. I object on the grounds of poor air quality

The increased congestion that will result from the plan will inevitably reduce air quality. I am an asthmatic and suffer from severe chest infections about twice a year, which I am now suspecting is related to poor air quality in this area, which is not helped by living close to the A3 and M25. As mentioned, the huge developments being proposed,
particularly in the north east of the borough, will inevitably lead to considerable further congestion and to even greater levels of air pollution, which can only have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13233  **Respondent:** 15588929 / Alex Hutchings  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local
road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13290</th>
<th>Respondent: 15589665 / Anna Worsley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td>Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road &amp; Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.</td>
<td>Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13315  Respondent: 15589889 / Keith Macdonald  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the congestion that the proposed development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow, only being wide enough for one vehicle at a time. The main “pinch point” on The Street in West Clandon is a case in point: lorries travelling in opposite directions cannot pass each other and, when faced with a lorry, even cars need to mount the pavement to get past. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT most vigorously to the development proposed in the local plan which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads leading to further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever more popular pastime, particularly at weekends, with hundreds of cyclists passing through the local villages on their way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow roads surrounding the villages, and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments, there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk of injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements as mentioned above.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to, capacity such as the electrical network and sewers. Without plans to improve these services there should be no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send, will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services even further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision made for what will be the necessary increase in capacity of the Royal Surrey Hospital, Guildford. Where is this assessed and how will it be remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13468  **Respondent:** 15590593 / Johnathan Page  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy 1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1).

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13578  **Respondent:** 15593633 / Ila-Maria Patermann  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**We object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan** by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) to remove Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Green Belt.

- Traffic in the area is already ridiculous at peak times

- The health infrastructure is already being challenges as our family recently experienced a 6 month wait time for an important appointment

- The quality of air is very important and it is crucial to have sufficient green land in a place so close to London, which has already got plenty of environmental challenges.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13590  **Respondent:** 15593665 / Thomas Cope  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I OBJECT to the fact that the Local Plan takes no account of schools, doctors surgeries and roads that are already operating at full capacity. Another 4000 houses in this area with a conservative estimate of a further 8000 cars would be catastrophic.**

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13626</th>
<th>Respondent: 15593729 / Martin Warwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13643</th>
<th>Respondent: 15593729 / Martin Warwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13627</th>
<th>Respondent: 15593761 / Celestyn Kwapisiewicz</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13641</th>
<th>Respondent: 15593761 / Celestyn Kwapisiewicz</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| "Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/13729  Respondent: 15594817 / Toni Thompson  Agent: |
| "Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

1. **I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity
and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13768  Respondent:  15595489 / Michael Crates  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the Lack of proper infrastructure planning/capacity for sites
2. I object to the additional demands made on already overstretched Local healthcare facilities
3. I object to the increased demands on schools places
4. I object to not being able to exercise my right of choice for schools as areas are squeezed
5. I object to the additional demands made on Local policing facilities
6. I object to the Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13784  Respondent:  15595553 / Carol Davis  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The addition of 385 homes on sites A37, A38, A39, A40 and A 41 in the timeframe of 2018-2022 would be an unbearable strain on the local infrastructure.

The Plan does not address the provision or even consider the need for expanding local services. The Raleigh Junior School is full with no room for expansion and the Howard of Effingham Secondary School is also operating at full capacity. The drainage systems would not be able to cope and would have to be completely upgraded. The infrastructure including the roads, public transport and medical provision are totally inadequate for this housing proposal and would not be able to support this level of development. The impact on the residents of these villages must be considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13785  Respondent:  15595553 / Carol Davis  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy 11) policy 11

There are insufficient infrastructure details in the plan to support the enormous development that is planned. Many sites, including Garlick's Arch (A43), do not have any infrastructure improvements identified. Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13787  Respondent: 15595585 / Tim Wiggins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I do not believe that we can add thousands more homes into the Borough as the infrastructure will not support this. Last year my eldest daughter was going to Secondary School and due to the lack of places was first allocated a school in Addlestone which was impossible to get to. Additionally, in the 15 years that I've lived in the Borough I have sometimes worked in London and had to commute by train, either from Clandon or Woking - Woking is already impossible to get a seat on the train, and the Clandon trains are almost at capacity now (at Clandon, which is only 2 stops along the slow line to London), despite additional carriages, whereas there used to be spaces on the trains.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13803  Respondent: 15595681 / Willemien Downes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

   1. I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13827  Respondent: 15596289 / Catherine Bremford  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1) We already experience massive congestion in the villages and this plan will cause even more traffic congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. An additional 5,000 more houses would create dangerous and unsustainable traffic. There would need to be a clear plan in place to ensure congestion is not further increased in these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Another issue is that the local area would not be able to cope with the increase in traffic as there will be a huge rise in the amount of cars on the road meaning more pollution to the area and making the roads more dangerous. Also the noise levels will increase in a peaceful area where everyone gets on and lives without any conflict but by having more people in the area there is more of a chance that this will change. I don't think that the station or the local parade of shops will be able to cope with the high demands that will be brought upon by having such a huge increase of population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

POLICY II

1. I object to the scale of the development at Wisley, Garlicks Arch and Merrow because there is no provision for appropriate timely investment in infrastructure (roads, schools, hospitals etc). Anyone living locally would confirm that the road infrastructure is inadequate now, never mind having to cope with the extra volumes resulting from the Proposed Plan.

I object to in particular to the scale of development at Garlicks Arch and Merrow which will produce significant extra traffic volumes into and from Woking via Send Road and Potters Lane. Neither of these roads can safely or effectively handle increased traffic flows.

The Objections above demonstrate, Democratic deficit between the views of the local population and the unjustified scale of development in the Proposed Plan which places now value on existing amenity (i.e Green Belt) and contains no practical plans for infrastructure enhancement.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
You expect us to read through the acres of material on these issues, but nowhere do you give proposals for the Guildford Borough Council will solve the congestions problems at Burnt Common, how the doctor’s surgery will cope and where children will be educated.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13888</th>
<th>Respondent: 15598049 / Hugo Collinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am 16 and have lived in West Horsley all my life. I went to the Raleigh school and live nearby. I like living in the countryside as I enjoy taking my dogs for a walk nearby and seeing the deer, foxes, rabbits and other animals and insects. I don’t like that the Raleigh is always overcrowded and always has been with classes of at least 30 as the school needs to raise money. This won’t change if it moves it will just become a giant school and the terrible traffic problems and fumes that have been around Northcote Crescent and Nightingale Crescent will be moved into East Lane. Maybe this will make me happier except it will use up a field full of wildlife which is now part of the Green Belt. Please put this where there are old ugly buildings. If there are new houses will I be able to afford one or will I be a chosen first? Is this about money and numbers rather than about people? There won’t be enough doctors or parking or school places or good enough roads because this is not in the plan. It will mean that people like me will lose out and people like you will be happy. Surely the young should decide their future and the residents rather than parents at the Raleigh who are not resident and probably live in other villages or Guildford as they don’t care about us. <strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong> <strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13913</th>
<th>Respondent: 15598241 / Madeleine Hewish</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic <strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong> <strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13966</th>
<th>Respondent: 15598721 / Trevor Ottaway</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13971  Respondent: 15598721 / Trevor Ottaway  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13975  Respondent: 15598817 / Paul Quy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that this development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure - (Policy I1)

There is already too much traffic in our villages - Ripley is a point in case - traffic cutting through Ripley from Junction 10/A3 to get across towards Pyford/Woking via Newark Lane (B367) means tailbacks already stretch back along the Portsmouth Road (B2215) to the roundabout under the Ripley Bypass (A3). There are no plans to improve issues like this. Rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths - with 5000 more homes this means dangerous conditions particularly for cyclists, pedestrians/walkers and children in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13979  Respondent: 15598817 / Paul Quy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I Object to the lack of proper infrastructure for sites - (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements that support the huge scale of the proposed development, particularly at Garlick's Arch (A43) - it has no infrastructure projects within the Infrastructure Schedule to support this.

Having lived in the area for 17 years, I can vouch for the fact that Local Services, Utilities & Sewerage, Doctors and medical facilities are all at, or very near capacity - a further influx of residents on the scale proposed would place incredible strain on these already-stretched services.

I also further understand that there are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and Police/Emergency services to cover this additional influx of residents in some 5,000+ houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13987  Respondent: 15599009 / Alison J Young  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The amenities and infra structure of the Horsleys are all ready either under pressure or at capacity.

The Raleigh school is full with no room for expansion. In a high birth rate entry year not all children in the Horsleys can be accommodated at the school.

In view of the building of a new Howard of Effingham school being rejected and the existing school being full to capacity, there will not be enough local secondary school places for local children if the plan goes ahead.

The roads are already busy in the Horsleys with queues developing on the A246 and along Ockham Road South where it joins the A246 in peak periods. The proposed development at the hotel site, adjacent to dangerous bends on the A246, particularly concerns me. An additional junction here at an already busy and dangerous location will only exacerbate the situation.

Parking at East Horsley village shops is already congested and at times it is impossible to find a parking space. Increased inhabitants in the Horsleys will increase pressure on parking still more.

The medical centre seems routinely unable to offer an appointment for up to a fortnight, so an increased population will no doubt extend waiting times.

Based on these points I object to the proposed Guildford local plan 2016.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13997  Respondent: 15599105 / Ryan McQuade  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Secondly, is that the local amenities like Budgens and the taekaways, and even the hairdressers won't be able to deal with the amount of people being brought to the village, and therefore may go elsewhere affecting these companies profit margins.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13999  
Respondent: 15599105 / Ryan McQuade  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Fourthly local schools own't be able to deal with the sheer weight of new students and therefore could have to reject potential students. Finally Thames water has advised the council that the current wastewater network in the area is unlikely to be able to support the extra houses causing an upgrading costing thr local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14008  
Respondent: 15599201 / Marlies Colborne-Barber  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Not only that, the infrastructure simply does not exist, certainly not in the Guildford Borough where roads are already inadequate, hospitals and doctors surgeries are not coping, transport systems are under severe pressure as are the schools. The plan makes no provision for putting this right, just feeble remarks suggesting each development will have to look into available possibilities. It is a joke!!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14016  
Respondent: 15599297 / Janice Mcouat  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

At the present time it takes two to three weeks to see a doctor at the local doctors surgery, we don’t need any additional housing of this scale in our villages. I object to Guildford council alleged housing need numbers when they fail to produce any undeniable evidence.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/14017  Respondent: 15599329 / Luke Attfield  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection to this proposal as it would ruin the local environment. Having studied at school the impact of large numbers of people on the areas such as the ones in the proposed villages this plan is not sustainable and would cause a lot of congestion on the roads, trains and emergency services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14060  Respondent: 15601057 / Chris Vinall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14095  Respondent: 15601121 / Elspeth Anderson  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in
the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from lack of parking space. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists ride through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have serious doubts about the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents? in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre in Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Funding for police services is constantly being reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14149   Respondent: 15601185 / Jane Young   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable
(and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14146</th>
<th>Respondent: 15601249 / Ann Barrass</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road &amp; Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy 11. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14191  Respondent: 15601409 / Adam Wheeler  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of foresight given to the infrastructure required to accommodate all these additional families, where would the children go to school? How would you ever get a Doctors appointment? The roads would be permanently blocked and therefore become even more damaged and dangerous and as I mentioned earlier there is a very limited bus service.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14202  Respondent: 15601473 / Joseph Fort  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and strained to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services. The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value. The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem. The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceeding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable. The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints. The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model. Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods. Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan. The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network. It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below. In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the
The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Fourthly, the infrastructure is already overloaded and no consideration has been given to already overstretched medical and educational facilities nor to the reality of what the extra housing and cars means for the existing community - in terms of congestion, pollution and quality of life - all of which would be degraded by these plans. On this basis too I object to the proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14398</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602561 / Jonathan Clark</th>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14409</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602561 / Jonathan Clark</th>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14433  Respondent: 15602817 / Paul Douek  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16479  Respondent: 15603297 / Rony Douek  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). There is no question that this will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley and Send, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic. This is a massive concern as today I live off Ripley and am already concerned about the level of traffic, in particular at peak hours. The traffic queues are already unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16482  Respondent: 15603297 / Rony Douek  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
- I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools? I have read other peoples concerns in this regards and can only agree.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14511  Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY) • Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan. • Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure. • Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure. • Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first. • No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly 5 considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16283  Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY) • Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan. • Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure. • Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure. • Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first. • No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly 5 considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14549  Respondent: 15603489 / Simon Pitt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14554  Respondent: 15603521 / Nicholas Bullman  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is only a vague mention of schools in the Definitions under Policy I1 Infrastructure and Delivery

- We already have a lack of state primary school places in the village. For example, our daughter was on a waiting list to get into The Raleigh primary school until the very last moment when someone else decided to send their child to Glenesk. We were very close to having to drive our daughter from West Horsley to a different town for a school place, which when both parents have to work would have been a life damaging inconvenience. The new developments would be putting any new families that could actually afford to live there into this awful situation. The Raleigh - which serves children from West and East Horsley - has been full every year for many years

- Howard of Effingham secondary school places are already limited and other secondary schools mean much longer commutes (in terms of both time and distance) from West Horsley village. We moved here on the basis that our children would be able to attend the local schools, and have made huge sacrifices to do this. We barely managed for our daughter to get accepted into The Raleigh, and can only hope she will make it to Howard. The proposed increase in housing in West Horsley (and East Horsley) simply does not address the already acute shortage of local school places for existing residents/housing.

- Glenesk and Cranmore private schools situation in East and West Horsley are also at or very near full capacity each year. Pupils attending there travel for up to 14miles to attend, adding to a high volume of traffic to and from each school twice a day on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively. A large increase in other road users in the area will aggravate this situation considerably.

Medical facilities

- Whilst we live in West Horsley, we can’t even use the local Kingston Avenue Medical Centre and have to travel to Send. As far as we understand, Kingston Avenue Medical Centre is already at capacity and can’t even serve existing local residents such as ourselves. Only a possible extension to Kingston Avenue is mentioned, it doesn’t sound sufficient given the existing situation.
• The planned population increase for the Borough (in excess of Government ONS forecasts) will require a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to cope as well.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14558  
Respondent: 15603521 / Nicholas Bullman  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Waste Water Infrastructure

• Sewage overflow problems already exist in the Ockham Road North/Green Lane area. Guildford Borough Council has already been advised that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand from the proposed developments. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will need to be upgraded to handle this demand. Advice from Thames Water is that they need a 2 to 3 year lead-in period to install necessary wastewater network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14566  
Respondent: 15603521 / Nicholas Bullman  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Access to essential facilities

• The small shop in West Horsley village already has very poor access and parking. A large increase in village population will make this problem even worse.

• Parking is already challenging when travelling to East Horsley shops and library. The proposed increase in development/population will exacerbate this issue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14610  
Respondent: 15603905 / Michael Douek  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14620  Respondent: 15603905 / Michael Douek  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14663  Respondent: 15604289 / Lesley Pitt  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1) Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt...
developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing
estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services. Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14708  **Respondent:** 15606561 / Rebecca Warwick  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)**

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14732  **Respondent:** 15606561 / Rebecca Warwick  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14709  **Respondent:** 15606593 / James Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)**
This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14733  Respondent: 15606593 / James Green  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14710  Respondent: 15606625 / Rebecca Sear-George  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14734  Respondent: 15606625 / Rebecca Sear-George  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14711</th>
<th>Respondent: 15606657 / Kim Hopwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)**

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

| Attached documents: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14735</th>
<th>Respondent: 15606657 / Kim Hopwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

| Attached documents: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14793</th>
<th>Respondent: 15607425 / Louise Quy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements that support the huge scale of the proposed development, particularly at Garlick's Arch (A43) - it has no infrastructure projects within the Infrastructure Schedule to support this. Having lived in the area for 17years, I can vouch for the fact that Local Services, Utilities & Sewerage, Doctors and medical facilities are all at, or very near capacity - a further influx of residents on the scale proposed would place incredible strain on these already-stretched services.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

| Attached documents: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14796</th>
<th>Respondent: 15607425 / Louise Quy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
There is already too much traffic in our villages - Ripley is a point in case - traffic cutting through Ripley from Junction 10/A3 to get across towards Pyford/Woking via Newark Lane (B367) means tailbacks already stretch back along the Portsmouth Road (B2215) to the roundabout under the Ripley Bypass (A3). There are no plans to improve issues like this. Rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths - with 5000 more homes this means dangerous conditions particularly for cyclists, pedestrians/walkers and children in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the narrow A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and West Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In the latter, where we live there are stretches of the main road without any pavements at all which makes it especially dangerous for pedestrians already. Access onto the road from the junior school, the church, vicarage, garden centre, Clandon Park, village hall, British Legion Club, the 2 pubs, nursing home and golf course are poor and potentially dangerous.

In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills.

It was part of the Olympic cycling route which has made it even more popular. With not any proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. I repeat that. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14817</th>
<th>Respondent: 15607681 / Robin Hopwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14828</th>
<th>Respondent: 15607681 / Robin Hopwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14835</th>
<th>Respondent: 15607937 / Joanna Kaminska-Hine</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the local plan based on the strain this will put on Emergency services, a new hospital, fire station and policing facilities would need to be provided for so many new residents. The local ambulance trust is already struggling to meet its target attendance time which will only be further stretched with the increase in population at risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14839</th>
<th>Respondent: 15607937 / Joanna Kaminska-Hine</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a married woman hoping to start a family I am concerned about provision of school and healthcare capacity, as well as increased pollution and so object to the proposed developments on the basis of increased pollution, insufficient school places and insufficient healthcare facilities for existing residents let alone new residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14860  Respondent: 15608225 / Louise Wickham  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14872  Respondent: 15608225 / Louise Wickham  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14875  Respondent: 15608289 / Olivia Marshall  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will...
cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14895  **Respondent:** 15608545 / Madeleine Ringshaw  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements. I have personally witnessed HGVs mounting the pavements on many occasions because they are unable to pass oncoming traffic any other way on this narrow road. Only last week one HGV only narrowly missed one of our neighbours who was walking with her children on the way to school.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14986  Respondent: 15609473 / Ed Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The consultation does not deal adequately with infrastructure demands. Roads (especially the A3) in and around Guildford are increasingly congested as are commuter trains. Parking in Guildford and at stations is increasingly difficult and expensive. Parking at The Royal Surrey Hospital is now at the stage where outpatients need to allow 20 minutes just to find a space. This reflects the excellence of the services the hospital provides and it will need to be extended to serve the residents of 14,000 new homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15068  Respondent: 15610081 / Sarah Kelly  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15110   Respondent: 15610433 / Clare Porter   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15122   Respondent: 15610433 / Clare Porter   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15109   Respondent: 15610465 / Tess Corlett   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15121  Respondent: 15610465 / Tess Corlett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15127  Respondent: 15610529 / Mark Ransome  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is too much traffic in our villages already. The roads are busy throughout the day and not just at rush hour. This plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths.

Instead of building 5000 more houses which means dangerous and unsustainable traffic. The money would be better improving those roads so local communities can use them safely.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15131  Respondent: 15610529 / Mark Ransome  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15145  Respondent: 15610561 / Jo Graham  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Raleigh School in Horsley is full every year and secondary school places are limited at the Howard of Effingham. Further development in surrounding area would result in families who have lived in the village for a number of years not being able to send their children to the local school which is totally against the ethos of a village community.

The villages of Horsley offer a small Post office and library to the local residents. Any significant increase in the local population would put extensive pressure on these facilities. Parking is also very difficult at all times of the day and around the villages. Again, an increase in people wanting to use the village presents parking challenges as there is no obvious area of where extensions can take place and will also increase congestion. There are a lot of elderly people and children who visit both of the East Horsley village parades and an increase in traffic poses significant safety risks.

The Horsley medical centre in Kingston Avenue already services a large number of patients but it is extremely busy and it is often difficult to get appointments. An increase in the local population would further exacerbate this issue and also put additional pressure on the wider health service and the Royal Surrey County Hospital.

In conclusion, although I appreciate a need for housing within Surrey, the quota that has been identified for the Horsleys, Ockham and surrounding areas is a significantly unfair proportion. As I have mentioned in my correspondence, the proposals will have a significant degrading to the well being of the residents of the area and destroy the habitat, charm and character of the villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15186  Respondent: 15610785 / Liz Vinall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will
cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16561  Respondent: 15610913 / Gillian Hague  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I STRONGLY OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. Please refer to the key points highlighted at the beginning of this letter. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion and difficulties/danger in accessing, crossing or simply walking along the road. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic, more parking problems and significantly greater danger to pedestrians, car users, residents and visitors trying to access the road and the numerous cyclists now using the roads as routes in to the Surrey Hills as a result of the Olympic legacy.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the
road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements or when pedestrians need to cross from one side of the road to the other (for example at the station entrance).

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of The Royal Surrey Hospital in Guildford, how is this to be assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15228  Respondent: 15611105 / Ramsey Shubbar  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15246  Respondent: 15611105 / Ramsey Shubbar  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15227  Respondent: 15611137 / Scott Hutchinson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15245  Respondent: 15611137 / Scott Hutchinson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15226  Respondent: 15611201 / Jed Alexander  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15244  **Respondent:** 15611201 / Jed Alexander  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15311  **Respondent:** 15612481 / Gillian Culmer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/15391</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15614241 / Jane Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the fact that infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels – roads, doctors, schools will not be able to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Already, with no additional building, we are constantly flooded (even in the months of June and July 2016), as the drainage in the area is inadequate.

Other services in the local area are also inadequate for the number of homes and business which are already here - e.g. drainage, gas mains, electricity and water services.

Our schools are already over-crowded.

Our doctors surgeries are at "bursting-point". It takes several days to get to see a doctor at our local surgeries.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
• Howard of Effingham secondary school places are already limited and other secondary schools mean much longer commutes (in terms of both time and distance) from West Horsley village. The proposed increase in housing in West Horsley (and East Horsley) simply does not address the already acute shortage of local school places for existing residents/housing.

• Glenesk and Cranmore private schools situation in East and West Horsley are also at or very near full capacity each year. There is already a high volume of traffic to and from each school twice a day on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively, from families that live outside of the area. This traffic added to the additional traffic as a result of the new housing, would result in gridlock.

Medical facilities

• Whilst we live in West Horsley, we can’t even use the local Medical Centre and have to travel to The Villagers Medical Centre in Send. Kingston Avenue Medical Centre in East Horsley already can’t serve existing local residents such as ourselves. Only a possible extension to Kingston Avenue is mentioned, it doesn’t sound sufficient given the existing situation.

• The planned population increase for the Borough (in excess of Government ONS forecasts) will require a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to cope. Again, I know the hospital is fit to burst and has had requests for additional parking and amendments to the exit/entrance to the A3 denied.

Waste Water Infrastructure

• Roads surrounding West Horsley, leading into the village centre/towards school/station etc, regularly flood (at least 3 times a year). The road to Ripley (Ripley Lane/Rose Lane) also floods on a regular basis.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15485  Respondent: 15615745 / Nicholas Thompson  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested.

Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15517</th>
<th>Respondent: 15616161 / Anna Joyce</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, I would like to highlight that some parts of the villages are already in disrepair as a result of current usage (roads, pavements, drains) and I do not see how these will be improved with the addition of hundreds more houses in the immediate area. This must be recognised and addressed. There is frequent flooding on the roads from blocked drains and the roads are very dangerous at certain points due to being narrow and without road markings.

In conclusion, I understand the need for future development and forward planning for the area but the proposed plans are too wide-ranging, too large and do not adequately take into account how existing infrastructure will cope. I wholeheartedly believe the proposed plans will have a detrimental impact on what I consider to be two of the most beautiful and historically important villages the country.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15544</th>
<th>Respondent: 15616929 / Nigel Wickham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)**

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15629  **Respondent:** 15618337 / Matthew Pitt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The plans are incomplete in respect of the necessary infrastructure:

1. Schooling, at all levels;
2. Healthcare, in all its forms;
3. Transportation has not been thought through adequately. Deferring to a later assessment, or just awaiting the unintended consequences, will not do.

   1. Redesigning Burpham junction to allow A3 Southbound access/exit, even with unconfirmed reports to widen the A3 through Guildford, will have unforeseen consequences on traffic flows across the area.
   2. Similarly, while noting the 2 extra stations, I do not believe that the full impact of these has been considered. For example, it is as if Merrow East will serve Gosden Hill, but the new station will draw in other traffic, which will disrupt the local area if not adequately considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15680  Respondent: 15618881 / Jayne Barmby  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT. Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communication services. The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. This is not sensible. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsuitable development will take place by a more insidious process.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. (Residents have been incredulous at the Council’s failure to apply infrastructure constraints to housing numbers, in response first to the 2013, There were 20,000 responses each time.)

This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan is based on a wing and a prayer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15689  Respondent: 15618977 / Chris Marles  Agent: 
Burpham already has significant problems with road traffic. Adding thousands of extra vehicles onto these roads would only help to ensure gridlock.

The priority ought to be that the infrastructure is first put in place with 4 way A3 access and the tunnel.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Policy I1 - Infrastructure and Delivery

I object to any development without the necessary infrastructure being put in place prior to development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

The INFRASTRUCTURE does not start to be addressed until the housing is well under way.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services. The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income
necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value. The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem. The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsustainable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation. Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceeding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable. The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints. The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model. Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods. Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan. The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network. It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below. In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Para 4.10.3, 4 and 5 point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario 5...indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton. The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”. Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure. The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the...
A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided. The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR: Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road / Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3). Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8). Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14). Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction. Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction). Slyfield – there are no remarks relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact the A320 and Clay Lane. Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15807  **Respondent:** 15624577 / Alec Marshall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17927  Respondent: 15627009 / Alison Morrison  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the overall scale of development both residential and industrial because of the resulting pressure on infrastructure (road transport, rail, schools etc)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15938  Respondent: 15627265 / Rachel McClung  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of coherent proposals relating to schools and medical facilities for the Horsleys.

There is a continuing lack of state primary school places in the Horsleys. The Raleigh School which serves both East and West Horsley is full every year and this has been the situation for many years. Secondary school places are limited in number at the Howard of Effingham School and other secondary schools involve a much longer journey of time and distance from the Horsleys to reach them. Glenesk and Cranmore private schools are well supported by many families living in Guildford and other villages up to 14 miles away. Each of these private schools during term time, receives high volumes of traffic going to and from each school at each end of the school day, on Ockham Road North and the A246 respectively.

Kingston Avenue Medical Centre, serving all of East and West Horsley and areas beyond, is always extremely busy and residents experience difficulty in making appointments. The planned population increase (in excess of Government ONS forecasts) for the borough will require a major extension of the Royal Surrey Hospital to cope.

I object to the lack of coherent proposals relating to waste water infrastructure for the Horsleys. These words receive a mention in Reasoned Justification under Policy 11, but no detail for West Horsley has been found in any of the Local Plan documents, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

There are known sewage overflow problems in the Ockham Road North / Green Lane area.
Thames Water has advised Guildford Borough that the area’s wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all the proposed developments. The foul drainage system from West Horsley to the treatment works north of Ripley will need to be upgraded to cope. Thames Water advises ‘a 2 to 3 years lead-in period’ to install the necessary waste water network and treatment capacity after planning permission for a development is granted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15949  Respondent: 15627329 / Loraine Crates  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the increased risk of accidents and deaths caused by increased traffic
2. I object to the congestion caused on the A3 and M25 trunk roads
3. I object to the increased congestion on the local village roads and lanes
4. I object to the unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic
5. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning/capacity for sites

I object to the additional demands made on already overstretched local healthcare facilities

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15954  Respondent: 15627393 / Brandon White  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15990  Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Minerals and Waste Planning
The county council supports the references to minerals and waste safeguarding and the inclusion of safeguarded areas and sites on the Policies Map. This supports the implementation of policies in the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 (SWP) and the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (SMP).

There are no significant implications in terms of the safeguarding of mineral resources. The proposed new settlement at the former Wisley Airfield (A35) is located within a minerals safeguarding area but it is considered very unlikely that the underlying sharp sand and gravel resource will be worked in future. Nevertheless, should the site be allocated in the Local Plan, the applicant should be required to investigate the potential for prior working before any planning application being submitted.

The county council seeks to encourage the recycling of construction and demolition waste and the use of recycled aggregate as both minimise the use of valuable land won aggregate. As such, we strongly support Policy D2: Sustainable design, construction and energy.

The provision of waste management infrastructure is essential to support a modern economy and needs to be considered alongside housing and employment growth (National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) Paragraph 1). It is important, therefore, that the borough council acknowledges in the Plan that waste management facilities are essential infrastructure to support new housing and industry.

The Local Plan should acknowledge that many waste management activities fall within the general industrial class in the Use Classes Order and can be considered to be a B1c, B2 or B8 use and can be located within modern, purpose-designed buildings on industrial estates. This accords with SWP Policy WD2, which states that "planning permission for development involving the recycling, storage, transfer, materials recovery and processing of waste will be granted on land that is, or has been used, or is allocated in a Local Plan or DPD or has planning permission for industrial or storage purposes." The SWP specifically identifies a number of urban sites and industrial estates in Guildford borough as being potential areas for accommodating waste management facilities, but this list is not meant to be exhaustive. We would additionally like to see Policy E2 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan under the heading of, "Industrial, warehousing and storage," make reference to the inclusion of suitable waste management facilities to reinforce the principle of directing waste facilities first to industrial/employment sites in urban areas in accordance with SWP Policy CW5.

An issue of concern for the county council which is not resolved in this version of the Local Plan relates to the potential loss of the allocated waste management site at the former airfield at Wisley. In our response, dated 18 September 2014, to the consultation on the previous Draft Local Plan, we pointed to the SWP allocation of the former airfield for waste management use and also an existing planning permission for a waste management facility. The proposals for Wisley effectively prejudice the implementation of Surrey’s waste strategy as set out in the SWP. We therefore object to this proposed policy and consider the Plan to be unsound in terms of being positively prepared in that it does not take account of the acknowledged requirement for waste management facilities and the SWP allocation.

In addition to these concerns, we have a number of comments relating to specific policies and supporting text as set out in the consultation document and these are included in the Appendix attached to this letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

- Comment ID: PSLPP16/16074
  - Respondent: 15631105 / Pamela Jacqueline Hagan
  - Agent:
Our roads in Ripley, Send and Clandon are already overused, in poor repair and often with no footpaths.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16077  Respondent: 15631105 / Pamela Jacqueline Hagan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (policy I1).

Local sewerage, services, utilities, doctors etc. are already close to capacity. There are inadequate infrastructure improvements planned and none planned for Garlick's Arch (A43). There are also no plans to improve the medical, police and emergency services to cover the extra 5000 houses planned in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16255  Respondent: 15637377 / Cieran Leigh  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure in Send, Ripley and Send Marsh and Clandon is already overloaded and even now the smallest disruptions cause gridlock over much of our essentially rural roads network. Please also note that:

• I object to an expanded A3 interchange at Burnt Common,
• I object to housing and business development proposed for land described as Garlick’s Arch,
• I object to housing development at Clockbarn Nursery,
• I object to housing development at Send Hill,

all of these sites being unsuitable and in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16347  Respondent: 15640897 / Jackie van Heesewijk  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I1 (INFRASTRUCTURE & DELIVERY) • Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan. • Excessive
housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure. • Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure. • Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first. • No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly 5 considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Funding for Police services is being. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16376  Respondent: 15641441 / Orna Talbot  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thus far we see a perverse number of new homes in the plan and no strategy to protect the quality of living for those who already reside here? What is the strategy to protect the quality of schooling for my child, to keep roads safe, medical services, public transport, parking? In short what is the infrastructure strategy so support these new planning proposals?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16418  Respondent: 15641441 / Orna Talbot  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thus far we see a perverse number of new homes in the plan and no strategy to protect the quality of living for those who already reside here? What is the strategy to protect the quality of schooling for my child, to keep roads safe, medical services, public transport, parking? In short what is the infrastructure strategy so support these new planning proposals?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16384  Respondent: 15641569 / Trevalyn Gregory  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Sewage and water provision risks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. INFRASTRUCTURE

There is no credible plan to ensure that the local infrastructure can cope with the proposed population increases. Schools, medical and dental services are already at full capacity. The rail network is at capacity at peak times - station car parks are full with no alternative parking available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. I OBJECT to the fact that there is no provision for a larger primary school within East or West Horsley despite the fact that Para 38 NPPF states that for large developments a primary school should be built within walking distance. Over 500 houses within East and West Horsley is large development when considering the size of the villages. The Surrey infrastructure review does not state that a new school is necessary despite the fact that the school is already oversubscribed causing children to be driven to other villages. (They do state the school may in the future identify a suitable site through infill opportunities). Surrey have suggested that children from the Horsleys can be accommodated either in Ripley or Clandon; both of which would necessitate parents driving, and in the case of Ripley travelling through a traffic blackspot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Pressure on drainage infrastructure

There already sewage overflow problems in the village such as the Ockham Road North/Green Lane area. An increase in the number of houses and users of the system is highly likely to cause a serious capacity issue with the existing sewer network in the village going right through to the treatment works.

Pressure on facilities

Key local facilities, such as the medical centre, dentists and chemists which are already busy (I have experienced waiting a few weeks for a non-urgent appointment) will suffer from an increase in demand and are not equipped or prepared to deal with a significant increase in population.

Pressure on local schools

Places at the local schools are increasingly difficult to come by and no extra schools are planned for the Horsleys, whilst school places proposed at Wisley Airfield are not planned until many years into the project. This causes me to be concerned that newcomers will struggle to find schools close to home and that the plans overall have not taken knowledge of the local area into account.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Local Plan, I hope that some of my comments and observations are of value to your discussion surrounding the Local Plan and look forward to hearing the outcome of these discussions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

• Transport evidence is not yet fit for use and major transport issues are unresolved, e.g. another river crossing, a central bus facility.

• Even if all the proposed highway improvements in the Plan were built, congestion would not improve. There would simply be a lot more people stuck in traffic. Traffic would get a great deal worse with more traffic from the major development sites coming in on the Epsom Road and London Road.

• Central routes being closed to through traffic, pedestrianised or used for development would make central roads busier than ever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

• Transport evidence is not yet fit for use and major transport issues are unresolved, e.g. another river crossing, a central bus facility.

• Even if all the proposed highway improvements in the Plan were built, congestion would not improve. There would simply be a lot more people stuck in traffic. Traffic would get a great deal worse with more traffic from the major development sites coming in on the Epsom Road and London Road.

• Central routes being closed to through traffic, pedestrianised or used for development would make central roads busier than ever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**POLICY I1 - Infrastructure and delivery**

I object to this policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the Plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the villages of Ripley, Send and West Clandon, the roads serving the villages will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends when hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on their way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the villages and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury to the public. In the case of West Clandon, the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one (alternating) side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements as some have to do in places in order to pass.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this Plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the Plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local Plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This Plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic, with very little evident thought or planning as to how this is to be achieved, and how it will be funded. Implementation is critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and Community Infrastructure Levy income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the Plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as many local doctors’ surgeries will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity with waiting times of 2 weeks to see a GP. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services. There is no provision for increasing the capacity of the Royal Surrey County Hospital, Guildford. Where is this to be assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16888  Respondent: 15657121 / Robert Wheeler  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no credible infrastructure for the plans you have set forth. The local surgeries are already at breaking point with the amount of people that use there dwindling services, there is no way that the roads can take the increase in traffic that this development will create. The A3 and M25 will turn into car parks on a daily basis, while the local roads of the villages will come to a continuous stand still. Two thousand homes means more families living in the area. We don't have the schools to take in their children. You will take a green community and turn it into a smog filled hell hole which will sit on the door steps of Guildford. You are creating an abhorrent abomination that will not solve or remedy any current or underlying issue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17014  Respondent: 15664065 / Jo van Herwegen  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure

The level of development proposed within East and West Horsley represents an increase by 35% and is such that the village cannot accommodate that level of development without major investment in infrastructure and other local provisions, especially schools, medical facilities and sewage facilities.

Public Transport

Public transport links East and West Horsley are the train line and infrequent bus service.

The north-bound platform of the train station is not accessible to the frail, disabled, or those with young children as there is no step-free access. Any one travelling London bound, or returning from Guildford who is unable to use the bridge cannot use the Horsley train station and is advised by national rail to get off a stop early (or late) and catch a taxi from Clandon. The provision of a step-free pedestrian bridge over the railway would be required for a sustainable development.
Car parking in the station will also need to be extended to accommodate the additional volume of cars expected from the new sites within the village and Wisely airfield.

**Highways**

No details have been given on what is planned for the “East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme between 2019 and 2023”.

The road network into and around the villages will require significant investment to take the higher volumes of traffic.

Access to the villages is through two routes: ‘The Street’ through West Horsley and B2039 through East Horsley. Both narrow to such an extent that there is not sufficient space for two highway lanes, and road markings disappear. In order to allow the higher volumes of cars pass one-another, the roads will need to be widened to accommodate the increased volume of traffic.

A3 northbound junction at Wisley. Due to the proximity to the M25 junction, there is a conflict between road users travelling London bound from Guildford moving into the A3 exit slip lane to join the M25, and joining the A3 at this junction. The additional volume of traffic joining at this junction will exacerbate current congestion and is likely to lead to more accidents without major investment and re-routing of this junction.

**Drainage / Sewerage**

The sewerage network within the village is unable to cope with the additional demand from the proposed developments, and will require significant investment to meet this additional load.

**Flooding**

There are areas within the village which are within flood zones 2 and 3, measures are required to ensure current housing does not become more prone to flooding, and water can drain freely (see drainage above).

**Medical facilities**

There are possible proposals to extend the Kingston Avenue Medical Centre. This medical facility is already extremely busy, and an extension at least in proportion to the increase in residents is required to ensure that all village residents have access to essential healthcare services.

Due to proposed additional residents within the Guildford area, major investment will be required within the Royal Surrey County Hospital to accommodate this.

**Schools**

The local plan does not address the additional expansion of educational services required to meet the needs of the extra residents. Currently schools and educational services already experience waiting lists. There is one comprehensive school (Raleigh) within the village which is already full. This will need investment to accommodate the significant number of additional residents.

Given the main secondary school within the area, Howard of Effingham, will have a significant volume of additional houses within its wider catchment area (which is not just limited to East and West Horsley), provisions desperately need to be increased to ensure that sufficient education is available for the larger population.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17038</th>
<th>Respondent: 15664609 / Diane Pengilly</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the damaging of the local environment. People buy homes in these villages because they like living in a village environment with less traffic and less people. I object to villages being grown into each other so you have mass urbanisation and I object to it more so as the area is supposed to be protected from this development because it is green belt! There is no exceptional circumstances for Ripley, Send and Clandon to be removed as per National Planning Policy. You need instead to concentrate on developing the existing brown field site at Burnt Common whilst also considering the impact of this volume of housing and making provision for healthcare facilities and schools on the site to at least alleviate some of the pressures you will cause as a result of this impact in other surrounding areas and the local roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy 11)

Policy 11 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick's Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents' in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick's Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Aside from the disregard for the Green Belt, there seems to be absolutely no consideration as to the impact that the construction of thousands of new homes (and the subsequent significant increase in the local population) will have on communities and in particular local infrastructure.

The Street in West Clandon, may for historic reasons be deemed an A road, but in reality is nothing more than a local B road. Traffic is already very heavy and the road in some parts too narrow which leads to large lorries and or coaches having to mount the pavement (in many cases at inappropriate speeds) to avoid the oncoming traffic. I have lost count of the number of occasions we have had to repair our fence over the past 12 years owing to cars that have lost control and driven through it. We have had to do so twice in the past 12 months alone. The significant increase in traffic that your plan would create will only make this road increasingly dangerous and I fear it is only a matter of time before somebody is seriously hurt, or worse killed.

I think too about the impact on local train services from Clandon station, especially at rush hour, where already commuters are forced to stand for significant portions of their journey to and from London. Also the pressures on doctors surgeries where even at the excellent Merrow Park surgery it can take 2 weeks or longer to book an appointment for anything other than an emergency.

This is not ‘nimbyism’ on my part. My ‘back yard’ is already over-populated. The roads are supporting more cars than they were originally designed for, rail services are overcrowded, doctors surgeries and hospitals are struggling to cope with the demands being made of them. This is not an exhaustive list.

Never has the Green Belt and the purpose for which it was introduced been so relevant.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17137  Respondent: 15667105 / The Howard Partnership Trust (Vicky Lochead)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

REPRESENTATIONS TO GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL’S PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN (2016)

Introduction


THPT is a Multi-Academy Trust which was created in November 2013 and is led by Howard of Effingham School which is an ‘Outstanding’ school and is a designated Academy Sponsor. As the first federation of schools in Surrey, formed in 2007 at the request of the Local Education Authority (LEA) and Department for Education (DfE), the school has a longstanding tradition of highly effective partnership working.

The Multi-Academy Trust is currently comprised of eight schools (three secondary and five primary – including infants and junior). THPT continues to be asked by the LEA and DfE to work with other schools to enhance on-going development of effective partnerships across both primary and secondary phases and to help raise standards of student achievement throughout Surrey. The Trust believes that integral to its on-going success is ensuring that staff and students have access to the highest quality learning environments and facilities.
The Trust is currently pursuing proposals, in partnership with Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd to secure new school premises for its lead-school in Effingham – Howard of Effingham School. These proposals were supported in the Draft Local Plan (2014) but have been refused planning permission and are subject to a current Planning Appeal.

These representations focus on the current Borough-wide infrastructure policy and site allocations for education in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, and the background documents which seek to justify those allocations. They begin with a review of National Policy, followed by a summary of our understanding of the Local Plan policies for education and its evidence base, and a review of that against the soundness tests in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). They conclude that as drafted these policies are fundamentally unsound.

National Policy

Government policy since 2010 has placed an increasing emphasis on the role of schools as independent institutions in driving improvements in national education performance. The Government has strongly encouraged schools to become self-governing, through the promotion of Academies and the expansion of successful schools to maximise parental choice. Whilst Local Education Authorities (in this case, Surrey County Council) have a statutory role in ensuring sufficient school places in their areas, the 2011 Education Act included a presumption in favour of Free Schools and Academies providing these places.

This approach has been re-emphasised in the most recent Government policy. In March 2016, the new Education White Paper – Educational Excellence Everywhere extended the focus of the Coalition Government administration on driving national improvements by giving greater autonomy and leadership roles to Outstanding schools. The White Paper states that:

"We believe that the fastest and most sustainable way for schools to improve is for government to trust this country’s most effective education leaders, giving the freedom and power, and holding them to account for unapologetically high standards for every child, measured rigorously and fairly. This system will respond to performance, extending the reach of the most successful leaders and acting promptly to reduce the influence of those who aren’t delivering for our children. But it will also do more to set up these leaders for success, ensuring they have the necessary tools to seize the opportunities provided by greater autonomy and ensuring that for as it is required, support is available for them to draw on when they choose. This model underpins every one of the reforms set out in this White Paper’’ (para 1.14).

The White Paper promotes the role of Multi Academy Trusts in achieving this. Howard of Effingham School is the lead school in a Multi Academy Trust and is also an ‘Outstanding’ school in its own right. It has identified the need for new premises, both to maintain and enhance its role as an outstanding school, and also to meet additional local needs.

This approach to education policy is reflected in national planning policy. Paragraph 72 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is set out in full below:

“The Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education.

They should:

Give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools;

Work with schools promoters to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted”.

The highlighted part of the text emphasises that local authorities should not just be planning for new infrastructure to meet the needs of development in their areas, but also expanding and improving schools to promote choice.

The NPPF and the Government’s earlier policy statement, Planning for Schools Development (2011), emphasise the need for local authorities and schools to work together pro-actively from an early stage to plan for state school development. Schools have an important role to play in the development of policy and priorities.

This adds emphasis to the Government’s requirement that one of the strategic priorities of local plans should be:
“the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other cultural facilities” (para. 156).

Overall then, national policy places a very strong emphasis on the need to plan for the creation, expansion and alteration of schools, in a pro-active way, with schools themselves in order to enhance education standards and meet local community needs. As well as being consistent with National Policy, in order for plans to be found sound they must be positively prepared, justified against reasonable alternatives, and effective (deliverable).

**Proposed Local Plan Policy**

Policy I1 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan sets out the Council’s preferred approach to infrastructure delivery, including schools. This cross-refers to an Infrastructure schedule at Appendix C of the Plan. The section on secondary school provision in the Appendix is set out on pages 300 to 302.

Compared with proposals in the Draft Local Plan (2014), the Proposed Submission Local Plan allocates land for three new secondary schools, all as part of new strategic developments. These include: a minimum 4FE school at Gosden Hill Farm Strategic Site; a 4FE school at the former Wisley Airfield (which has recently been refused planning permission); and a 7FE school at the Normandy/Flexford strategic site. Whilst the evidence identifies an immediate need for new school capacity, the Housing Topic Paper suggests that the majority of provision on these sites is anticipated post-2027 (paragraphs 4.162 and 4.126). The Proposed Submission Local Plan is silent on the need to expand or alter schools to meet existing and future needs and on how widening choice in education might be achieved.

Neither the Housing Topic Paper nor the Guildford Draft Local Plan Education Review (2016), which was also published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan, set out when schools would be likely to be provided on these sites, by whom and whether they can meet needs in a timely manner. Pages 576 to 581 of the Land Availability Assessment (LAA) (2016) undertake what we regard as a limited and arbitrary assessment of potential secondary school sites. In particular, it does not consider suitability, timing or deliverability of the sites concerned.

On the basis of these limited and superficial assessments, the Council has removed all three secondary school site allocations in the previous Draft Local Plan (2014), and replaced them with entirely new sites in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

The Council did not, contrary to clear guidance from Government, seek to engage with Howard of Effingham School a known interested party with whom the Council had been involved in pre-application discussions on the proposals which are currently subject of a planning appeal, to identify its needs for expansion or alteration, or its views on existing education requirements, the emerging conclusions of the LAA or other local plan evidence base documents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
which ALL need to be considered fundamentally before any additional housing is approved & built.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17242  Respondent: 15673185 / Simon Jefferies  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that the plan implies modal shift to cycling and walking which in the rural areas is completely unrealistic due to lack of proper pedestrian footpaths on local roads and the requisite street lighting to ensure the safety of users. Much of the borough is RURAL IN NATURE and residents specifically do not want to live in well-lit areas more akin to urban living.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17248  Respondent: 15673185 / Simon Jefferies  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the impact of large numbers of new residents on school places which has not been properly planned. For example, Send Primary School (in the process of being rebuilt) is being rebuilt with no spare capacity. The proposed redevelopment of the Raleigh School in Horsley [not even in the local plan] is only for redevelopment not for enlargement. Schools planned for Three Farms Meadows will not be operational for the first 500 houses of development. Where will those children go to school? There is no capacity. When the school is built at A35 children will have to be bussed in from elsewhere as it’s not possible to walk… adding to congestion on local roads and the Strategic Road Network

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17255  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I1: Infrastructure and delivery

Thames Water support Policy I1 and supporting text in principle as it is largely in line with previous representations, but consider that minor changes would be helpful to provide clarity.
Thames Water support the Policy in principle as a key sustainability objective for the preparation of the new Local Plan. New development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the NPPF states: “Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:...the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater.”

Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: “Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment....take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.”

The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in March 2014 includes a section on ‘water supply, wastewater and water quality’ and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that “Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development” (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).

Thames Water support the identification of water supply and waste water treatment infrastructure at paragraph 4.6.3, but given the importance of such infrastructure to sustainable development, it is considered that text along the following lines should be also included to support Policy 11: “The Council will seek to ensure that there is adequate water supply, surface water, foul drainage and waste water treatment capacity to serve all new developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity and surface water drainage both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing wastewater/sewerage infrastructure. Drainage on the site must maintain separation of foul and surface flows. Where there is an infrastructure capacity constraint the Council will require the developer to set out what appropriate improvements are required and how they will be delivered.

The development or expansion of water supply or waste water treatment facilities will normally be supported, either where needed to serve existing or proposed new development, or in the interests of long term water supply and waste water management, provided that the need for such facilities outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impact that any such adverse impact is minimised.”

Development Close to Thames Water Assets:

Where development is being proposed within 800m of a sewage/waste water treatment works, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. The odour impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in closer proximity to a sewage treatment works.

Where development is being proposed within 15m of a pumping station, the developer or local authority should liaise with Thames Water to consider whether an odour and / or noise and / or vibration impact assessment is required as part of the promotion of the site and potential planning application submission. Any impact assessment would determine whether the proposed development would result in adverse amenity impact for new occupiers, as those new occupiers would be located in closer proximity to a pumping station.

Where any such odour study in relation to development near a sewage treatment works or pumping station identifies there is an odour impact for proposed development and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.
Sustainable Drainage:

Thames Water recognises the environmental and economic benefits of surface water source control, and encourages its appropriate application, where it is to the overall benefit of their customers. However, it should also be recognised that SUDS are not appropriate for use in all areas, for example areas with high ground water levels or clay soils which do not allow free drainage. SUDS also require regular maintenance to ensure their effectiveness.

Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system. By doing this, SuDS have the potential to play an important role in helping to ensure the sewerage network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change.

SuDS not only help to mitigate flooding, they can also help to:

- improve water quality
- provide opportunities for water efficiency
- provide enhanced landscape and visual features
- support wildlife
- and provide amenity and recreational benefits.

With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in the Masterplan: “It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding.”

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17278  Respondent: 15674689 / Chris Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the size of the proposed housing development as there are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17280  Respondent: 15674689 / Chris Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17471  Respondent: 15687201 / Mandy Cox  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17478  Respondent: 15687201 / Mandy Cox  Agent:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17493  **Respondent:** 15687329 / Kim Sweeting  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Other infrastructure.
   Is there adequate power, drainage and sewage provision for industrial development and is there sufficient school, medical and similar provisions for domestic expansion?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17619  **Respondent:** 15688481 / Sally Lescher  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I1 Infrastructure and delivery

Most of the borough’s infrastructure is antiquated, congested and straining to accommodate even current needs and organic growth. Yet this plan’s commitment to building housing estates across the Guildford countryside will mean either major infrastructure investment that no-one is prepared to pay for or else a catastrophic and simultaneous collapse in transport, educational, medical, energy, water and communications services.

The plan targets greenfield sites – requiring heavy infrastructure investment – in order to generate CIL income necessary to meet an infrastructure shortfall that is already serious. The current draft CIL scale also encourages development on greenfield sites rather than brownfield and will reduce or negate developer's obligation to sell a percentage of homes at 20% below market value.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing infrastructure needs in this area is inadequate, identifying only the tip of an iceberg of existing congestion. Compton Village is already close
to tipping point, yet it will see a significant increase in traffic volume, will be completely congested and yet no plans exist to mitigate the problem.

The schemes referred to in this policy barely solve existing congestion and are inadequate when development takes place. The full impact on local road networks has not been fully considered. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that involve demolishing property and road-widening in residential areas to solve the resultant congestion. The A3 improvements are not guaranteed to take place but they are being used to justify removing large areas from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments have taken place. These detailed investigations are being deferred until the planning application stage and will be left to developers to prepare. If a site then proves to be unsustainable its Green Belt protection will have been lost for no reason and unsustainable development will take place by a more insidious process. Compton Village will actually incur increased traffic flow as a consequence of A3 widening according to the study, yet as was pointed out above, no solutions are in place to improve the situation.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritising greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly.

This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognising this as a key issue, the plan makes too many assumptions, not least being the verbal promise that development will not take place without infrastructure preceeding it. It is not clear how this will happen and is not in the Plan, as it should be, if it is achievable.

The highways network is under stress at peak times in many parts of the borough. Queuing is the daily experience of drivers going to and from work. The local plan recognises the problems in para 2.14. Much of the road network is single-carriageway, and junctions act as constraints.

The key evidence on future traffic conditions is provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which summarises the results of the tests carried out by Surrey County Council at the request of GBC. Five scenarios were examined using SCC’s strategic traffic model.

Scenario 1 contains all developments and planning permissions from 2009 to date. As such it corresponds to today’s circumstances, and describes the current unsatisfactory traffic conditions in peak periods.

Scenario 5 represents the position at the end of the plan period, including all development and highways schemes in the local plan.

The results of the analysis show that there will be widespread congestion in the morning peak hour across the network. The key strategic routes, the A3 through Guildford NE bound, and the M25 between Junctions 10 and 11, are shown to be at or over capacity. The summary network statistics presented in the SHAR, while useful, require some interpretation because the analysis of vehicle-hours is derived from link speeds only, and does not reflect junction delays and queues. The tables that show the ratio of flow to capacity and level of service are especially helpful to gaining an understanding of the conditions on the network in the forecast. Where the forecast traffic volume is above or close to capacity, flow becomes unstable and there is congestion. The SHA results provide evidence that, in 2031, congestion will be worse than it is today on much of the network.

It is the case that the traffic modelling does not take into account the potential for increased use of other modes, but the trip rates used for developments already have built in the typical level of use of other modes, and services will be required to meet that need. It is also the case that the model does not allow for park and ride, which would improve matters in the town centre, as discussed below.

In order to gain an insight into conditions across the network, it is necessary to combine information from several tables in the SHAR. Table 4.5 shows that the M25 and A3 will be at capacity in Scenario 5. The other roads that will have poor levels of service include those in Table 4.5 but also those in 4.12 (except the A3) and those in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 with levels of service E and F that will not be given some relief by improvement of the A3 in Scenario 5. Paras 4.10.3, 4 and 5
point out that there will be increased congestion. Given that the starting point is unsatisfactory, there can be no expectation that the schemes in the Infrastructure Development Plan will provide an overall improvement. There will be some local benefits, such as the Ash rail bridge for example, but in general conditions will be as bad and in many places, such as Compton Village, worse. So the statement in the SHAR para 4.2.5 that ‘the combined mitigation as reflected in Scenario5...indicates that at the strategic level it accommodates the additional PSLP demand’ needs qualifying – ‘at the cost of a lot of queuing’ and makes no mention of the impact this will have on pollution, which is already a known problem at the A3 end of Compton.

The cumulative effect of the additional traffic generated by the developments in the local plan will be to increase congestion, even with the proposed highway schemes in place. More detailed analysis of the junctions and queuing is required. So we question the conclusion that the developments would have “an acceptable impact on the capacity of the highway networks in terms of the policy test set in paragraph 32 of NPPF”.

Appendix 3 of the Transport Topic Paper shows the phasing of housing development and transport infrastructure.

The major scheme being considered for the A3 between the A31 and the A320 is scheduled for delivery in the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The strategic developments at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm are shown as being phased in from 2021/22 onwards. The Garlick’s Arch development is shown as starting in 2019/20. Therefore, there will be a period in which the existing A3 has to cope with the additional demand arising from those developments before extra capacity is provided.

The following comments regarding the strategic sites are taken from the SHAR:

Blackwell Farm – there will be congestion at the A31 junction, and the problems at the Tesco junction, and the Egerton road /Gill Avenue junction (para 4.9.5). Traffic is likely to access the Surrey research park and the RSCH through the development (para 4.7.3)

Gosden Hill Farm – there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham. There will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout (paras 4.7.6, 4.7.7 and 4.7.8).

Wisley – traffic will increase on minor roads to gain access to the A3 (N and S bound) and other routes (para 4.7.11). The development will add more traffic to the A3. The Burnt Common slips help alleviate the traffic through Ripley according to the model, but queuing on the A3 could mean this does not happen (para 4.7.14)

Normandy/Flexford – the report has little to say about the impact of this large development. The increase in flow on Westwood Lane is noted (para 4.5.7). Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show junction delay reducing at the Westwood Land, B3000 junction, but an increasing at the Puttenham Hill/Millbrook junction.

Ash – development in Ash is not specifically addressed, but there are major increases in traffic on a number of roads. The new rail bridge will bring relief (but traffic will move to the next junction).

Slyfield – there are no remark relating to SARP, and as there are no additional trips shown in and out of the Slyfield residential zone in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, it is possible that this development has been omitted. There is a significant increase in trips to and from the Slyfield industrial zone, which will impact on the A320 and Clay Lane.

Town Centre – the report has very little to say about the town centre. It is evident that the model is forecasting severe congestion on the approaches to the town centre, such as the A281, the A31 Farnham Road, and Woodbridge Road for example. No mitigation measures are planned. And in the Transport Strategy, GBC states that the intention is to adopt Allies & Morrison’s Scenario 2 which would have the effect of significantly reducing the capacity of the town centre road system. The implications have not been examined, but traffic using the A281 from Waverley, for example, would be affected.

The B3000 will be severely affected by development schemes and will not benefit from road improvements. It is essential that the impact of all change to road networks are looked at in conjunction with one another for any survey to be meaningful. The local plan does not state an objective for congestion. The two strategic objectives that are included for infrastructure refer to supporting sustainable development and delivering a balanced system. However, in
para 2.15 there is an aspiration expressed about opportunities ‘to improve the performance of the road networks through transport infrastructure and service improvements’, which taken with the previous paragraph includes reducing congestion. The evidence so far shows that this will not happen. The mitigation proposed is not sufficient to overcome the problems that will be caused by the level of growth in the local plan. Congestion will worsen. The network will lack resilience and be vulnerable to disruption due to incidents. Minor roads will have to cope with a lot more traffic, for which they are unsuitable.

** Images could not be opened **

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/1833  Respondent: 15689953 / Environment Agency (Oliver Rathmill)  Agent: 15693153 / Zurich Assurance Ltd  Barton Willmore LLP (Sinéad Morrissey)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2 Points of clarity and accuracy
2.1 Policy ID1: Infrastructure and delivery
The policy may benefit from incorporating some of the recommendations that came from the Water Quality Assessment (WQA) undertaken by AECOM.
For major developments in the Guildford, Ripley, and Ash Vale Sewage Treatment Works (STW) catchments it is recommended that the council embeds a development control policy within the local plan. This could require developers to provide evidence that they have consulted the sewer undertaker regarding capacity of the sewer network. Drainage strategies should also be submitted as part of the application to enable the sewer undertaker and the Environment Agency to fully assess the potential impacts on the sewer network. Developments should not be occupied before capacity of the sewer network to accommodate flows and capacity at the works is in place to treat to the required standard. For cases where capacity is not in place, the council could include wording in the policy on Grampian conditions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Zurich notes that reference to viability considerations when negotiating planning obligations has been removed since the Regulation 18 Draft GBLP was consulted upon. In accordance with paragraph 173 of the NPPF, Zurich recommends amendments that reference to viability considerations is reinstated except where the non-delivery of effected infrastructure would result in unresolved planning harm that is not outweighed by other material planning considerations. Revised wording for Policy I1 is set out below:

“To support delivery of this Local Plan, infrastructure needed to support development should be provided and available when first needed to serve the occupants and users of the development. This will be secured by planning obligation, planning condition, or from other infrastructure funding, including the Community Infrastructure Levy. Where the timely provision of necessary supporting infrastructure is not secured, development may be phased to reflect infrastructure delivery, or will be refused, unless evidence is provided to demonstrate that the delivery of such infrastructure would render the development proposal unviable and does not result in unresolved planning harm that is not outweighed by other material considerations”.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the plans for Wisley and Garlick’s Arch developments because no provision has been included for rail and given the overloading of the roads in the area, rail is the only type of new infrastructure that matters.

I object to the Local Plan’s malign intent for Send and Ripley because the nearest mainline station (Woking) is already overloaded and the Local Plan will only make matters worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the Local Plan because not enough has been done to show that the supposed needs in the Local Plan can’t be accommodated close to the transport and service centre in Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17802</th>
<th>Respondent: 15702497 / Isabella Mitchell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lastly the plan does not address the over-stressed and inadequate infrastructure of the area such as the condition and widths of the roads and the schooling requirements of the inhabitants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17831</th>
<th>Respondent: 15703937 / Graham Vickery</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also object to the proposed development at Wisley and Gosden Hill farm. The proposed developments are too great for the road infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also strongly object to the need for any additional new schools and doctor’s surgeries in the area. I am 19 years old and have completed a wonderful education using the existing schools and Merrow Surgery has also served me well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17848</th>
<th>Respondent: 15704865 / Lauren Hunt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the plan not making any comprehensive provision for the social infrastructure that must go with such a huge building programme. That is schools for the new population, more health centres, the means of accommodating their vehicle movements at the station, the car parks of the village and simply getting around on our roads built for 19th century traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17860  Respondent: 15705473 / Shane Ince  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Insufficient local infrastructure to support the increased housing - current parking, school facilities, medical facilities and transport facilities are already stretched and inadequate for existing needs. The excessive addition of the proposed housing will put an intolerable strain on the local community and inevitably result in a deterioration of such facilities, higher costs, lower quality and a poorer standard of living for residents. The existing and planned infrastructure simply cannot sustain such an increase in housing and people in this small area in my view.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17862  Respondent: 15705473 / Shane Ince  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Medical and schooling facilities - I am not convinced that the standard of local facilities provided for the education of our children and the treating of our infirm and elderly residents can be maintained with the addition of some many more houses and people. Existing facilities will be rapidly overloaded, while limited space exists to expand these to cope viably with the increases under consideration in your New Local Plan.

Negative environmental impact - the addition of so many more houses in the area will inevitably take its toll on the environment in terms of overloading our already old (in many cases) water drainage systems (both rain run-off and waste water), increasing noise pollution during construction and impacting air pollution from the additional cars that would inevitably come with the additional houses and people in the area. This can only lead to a detrimental impact on the health and safety of local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17869  Respondent: 15705537 / G-Bug – The Guildford Cycling Campaign (Doug Clare)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure and Delivery
As a Key Evidence document the Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2016 must be included in Appendix D but is not. As an important Local Plan document we comment on this separately at the end of our consultation response.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17877  Respondent: 15705729 / Martyn Heard  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Living in Newark Lane, I am only too aware of the already overloaded narrow country roads - local development on the scale proposed would be unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17885  Respondent: 15705761 / David Jenner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of planned road infrastructure. (Policy I1). I live on the Portsmouth Road which runs through Ripley and Send adjacent to Garlick's Arch. We are already coping with large amounts of traffic which is often diverted onto our road when an accident closes the A3. The A3 from the junction north of the village to the M25 is almost at a standstill during the rush hour both going north in the morning and coming south in the evening. All of the above developments are sited along the A3 and with the number of houses proposed probably in the region of an extra 5000 cars will be wishing to use our local roads. Congestion will be even worse and at present Highways England has no plans to start considering improving the A3 before 2020. There should therefore be no development until this has been considered (Policy I2).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18107  Respondent: 15705857 / GRH Hampshire  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It fails completely to recognise the infrastructure requirements. There are some laughable suggestions about transport. It mentions railway stations in the east and west of Guildford. There is no money in Control Period 5 or 6 for Network Rail
to build these stations. There is no Train Operating company considering that they should run services as there is no business case.

Car parks at local rail stations are more than 80% full, the point at which rail industry modelling dictates that they are full and deter people from using them.

The plans for more houses in Horsley are inappropriate. There is simply not the infrastructure in terms of roads, drainage, schools, medical facilities, transport etc etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/584  Respondent: 15711393 / Kirk Georgiou  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policies ID1 & ID2 Infrastructure – My Objections

Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits “…we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25
from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and /or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

**Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections**

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
-is already very congested at times

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18332  Respondent: 15717217 / Ian Ferguson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have lived in Burpham for 24 years and seen the steady rise in new builds, with no consideration to the improvement of essential infrastructure. Given the proposed number of dwellings and the huge impact this would have on our roads, transport and the utilities especially Water this cannot continue, so why is there a lack of specific details of essential infrastructure especially as there is an acknowledged existing deficit.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1609  Respondent: 15717217 / Ian Ferguson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Even taking account of all the proposals in the 2017 Plan, congestion which is already severe is set to get worse over the plan period.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18429  Respondent: 15724353 / Arvnid Parmar  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18458  Respondent: 15724673 / Matthew Bell  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18471  Respondent: 15724673 / Matthew Bell  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18465  Respondent: 15724801 / Talei Fawcett  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have poor condition narrow roads and no footpaths, which are dangerous. More houses will increase this danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18474  Respondent: 15724801 / Talei Fawcett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

The current and existing services are over-stretched now, so where are the infrastructure improvements to support the enormous proposed developments, including medical, public transport, schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18511  Respondent: 15725409 / Nicholas Ward  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy I1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/18512  **Respondent:** 15725409 / Nicholas Ward  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/18716  **Respondent:** 15733665 / Vortal Properties Ltd  **Agent:** Shrimplin Brown (James Brown)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

**POLICY I1: INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY**
This policy should define what is meant by strategic sites. Only the largest sites can realistically and effectively provide on-site infrastructure.

The identification and managed delivery of infrastructure by the Council and partners will be essential to support small and medium scale rural schemes which should not be expected to shoulder the burden of non-site specific infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This policy should define what is meant by strategic sites. Only the largest sites can realistically and effectively provide on-site infrastructure.

The identification and managed delivery of infrastructure by the Council and partners will be essential to support small and medium scale rural schemes which should not be expected to shoulder the burden of non-site specific infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/3528  Respondent: 15746081 / Highways England (Patrick Blake)  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY ID1: INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY

It is noted that the delivery of housing in the later stages of the plan period is dependent upon a major improvement to the A3 through Guildford. As set out in Policy ID1, it is essential that “the delivery of developments may need to be phased to reflect the delivery of infrastructure” and that “if the timely provision of infrastructure necessary to support new development cannot be secured, planning permission will be refused”. We consider this to be essential due to the existing congestion issues and the lack of certainty of any future scheme, as noted above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16002  Respondent: 15789441 / Education Funding Agency (Samantha Powell)  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford Borough Council proposed submission Local Plan Strategy and Sites (June 2016) : consultation under Regulation 19 of Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regs 2012

Submission of the Education Funding Agency

1. Thank you for seeking the Education Funding Agency’s (EFA) views on the above document; we welcome the opportunity to contribute to the development of planning policy at the local level.
2. The EFA was established in 2012 in order to help the government achieve its schools objectives by delivering effective capital programmes that improve the condition of existing buildings and support the creation of new places for pupils and learners. We manage £54 billion of funding a year to support all state-provided education for 8 million children aged 3 to 16, and 1.6 million young people aged 16 to 19.
3. The EFA aims to work closely with local authority education departments and planning authorities to meet the demand for new school places and new schools. As such, we would like to offer the following comments in response to the proposals outlined in the above consultation document:

Infrastructure Policies (Policy I1)

1. The EFA support reference within Policy I1 to securing contributions from developers towards school provision through CIL and s106. You will have no doubt taken account of the key strategic policies to reiterate this position, but it would be helpful if they were explicitly referenced within the document. In particular:

   National

   1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that local planning authorities (LPAs) should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of communities and that LPAs should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools to widen choice in education (para 72).
   2. The EFA support the principle of Guildford Borough Council (BC) safeguarding land for the provision of new schools to meet government planning policy objectives as set out in paragraph 72 of the NPPF. Support is also given for the siting of schools within the allocated sites in locations which promote sustainable travel modes for pupils, staff and visitors. There is also a need to ensure that the education contributions made by developers are sufficient to cover the increase in demand for school places that is likely to be generated by a development. When new schools are developed, local authorities should also seek to safeguard land for any future expansion of new schools where demand indicates this might be necessary.
   3. Guildford BC should also have regard to the Joint Policy Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Education on 'Planning for Schools Development' (2011) which sets out the Government’s commitment to support the development of state-funded schools and their delivery through the planning system.

Guildford BC Proposed Policy and Provision

1. The EFA welcomes the support in Guildford’s Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (para 4.6.3) to schools as necessary infrastructure required to help deliver sustainable growth in the borough. The EFA note that significant growth in housing stock is expected in the borough, with 14,500 new homes anticipated between 2017-2033. This will place significant pressure on social infrastructure such as education facilities.
2. In light of the above, the EFA encourages local authorities to work closely with us during all stages of planning policy development to help guide the development of new school infrastructure and to meet the predicted demand for primary and secondary school places.
3. In this respect, the EFA commends, for example, the approach taken by the London Borough of Ealing in producing a Planning for Schools Development Plan Document (DPD). The DPD provides policy direction and establishes the Council’s approach to providing primary and secondary school places and helps to identify sites which may be suitable for providing them (including on MOL), whether by extension to existing schools or on new sites. The DPD includes site allocations and policies to safeguard the sites, and was adopted in May 2016 as part of the Local Plan. The DPD may provide useful guidance with respect to securing site allocations for
schools in your emerging sites allocations document, as well as providing example policies to aid their delivery within your subsequent Development Management DPD.

4. The Guildford Draft Local Plan: Education Review (May 2016) provides a useful background document setting out Guildford’s requirements for new schools over the plan period. It confirms the need for 8FE primary places across the borough arising specifically from the strategic sites identified. In addition, it confirms 5FE secondary provision is required (beyond the existing planned provision) up to 2025. We note the Education Review is however intended to be reviewed and updated prior to the Strategy and Sites examination and request sight of this once published, to help inform any subsequent response from the EFA. Ensuring there is an adequate supply of sites for schools is essential and will ensure that Guildford can swiftly and flexibly respond to existing and future need for school places to meet the needs of the borough over the plan period.

5. The EFA’s comments on the identified sites for anticipated education provision over the plan period are set out in the table below. These include strategic sites and sites identified in Guildford’s Infrastructure Delivery Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location / (Strategic) Site allocation name /reference and approx. number of new homes.</th>
<th>Proposed FE (Primary and secondary)</th>
<th>Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) reference / and delivery date</th>
<th>EFA Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merrow / A25 Gosden Hill Farm c2000 homes</td>
<td>2FE primary</td>
<td>PED3 / Years 1-15 SED1 / TBC</td>
<td>Note the 2FE primary is to be funded by the development (serviced land and build costs) and the 4FE secondary part-funded (c50%) by the development. 4FE secondary - developer to provide serviced land and transfer it to SCC. Developer contributions (from other sites) to fund build. <strong>Support</strong> – this is an area where basic need will arise from the housing development proposed. The EFA would welcome the opportunity to work closely with Guildford BC to investigate the feasibility of opening a free school(s) on this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ockham /</td>
<td>2FE primary 4FE secondary</td>
<td>PED2 / Years 1-15 SED2 / TBC</td>
<td>Note the 2FE primary is to be funded by the development (serviced land and build costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35 land at former Wisley airfield</td>
<td>c2000 homes</td>
<td>4FE secondary part-funded (c50%) by the development. (Developer to provide serviced land at nil cost. Build costs from developer contributions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support</strong> – this is an area where basic need will arise from the housing development proposed. The EFA would welcome the opportunity to work closely with Guildford BC to investigate the feasibility of opening a free school(s) on this site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note that above two (Gosden Hill and Wisley) secondary schools could be run together or separately, depending on phasing and providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slyfield / c1,000 homes</td>
<td>1FE primary on site or cash contribution PED5 / Years 1-15 Note to be funded by the development (serviced land and build costs or a cash contribution for off-site provision)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note that above two (Gosden Hill and Wisley) secondary schools could be run together or separately, depending on phasing and providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell Farm / c1,950 homes</td>
<td>2FE primary to serve this devt PED4 / Years 1-15 Note to be funded by the development (serviced land and build costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy / Flexford / A46 Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford / c1,100 homes</td>
<td>Up to 7-8FE secondary (FE TBC at time of planning application) 1FE to serve this development, remaining capacity to serve Blackwell Farm Strategic site (1,950 homes) and wider area inc Ash (1,326 homes) Primary – if needed SED3 / TBC Note developer to provide erviced land at nil cost, build costs from developer contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support</strong> – this is an area where basic need will arise from the housing development proposed. The EFA would welcome the opportunity to work closely with Guildford BC to investigate the feasibility of opening a free school(s) on this site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>PED / Years</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash / 1,326 homes</td>
<td>(Potential) 1-2FE primary expansion of Ash Grange primary (if required to meet needs of homes south and east of Ash and Tongham)</td>
<td>PED6 / 0-5</td>
<td>Funded by developer contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyke Green</td>
<td>1FE primary expansion (of existing community/ maintained school) to serve strategic site A46 Normandy / Flexford</td>
<td>PED1 / 1-15</td>
<td>Funded by developer contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford town</td>
<td>Up to an additional 3FE in Guildford Town; SurreyCC currently in discussions with existing schools</td>
<td>PED7 / 1-5</td>
<td>Funded by developer contributions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access / Transport Issues**

1. In developing policies for new schools, consideration should be given at an early stage in the site appraisal process as to how the use of public transport, cycling and walking can be encouraged to help reduce the number of car journeys to and from new schools. The inclusion of a well-developed green travel plan can help to ensure that new schools are better integrated with existing communities.

**Developer Contributions, costs of school provision, CIL and EFA funding**

1. There is a need to ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to cover the increase in demand for school places that are likely to be generated by major developments in the borough. The EFA acknowledge the pupil yield calculator Surrey currently use to seek s106 contributions and support this approach in principle.
2. We note Guildford BC are currently preparing their CIL charging schedule and support the inclusion on the draft Regulation 123 list of primary school provision on strategic sites allocated in the Local Plan. The EFA would be particularly interested in responding to any review of infrastructure requirements, CIL draft charging schedule and (once adopted) any subsequent CIL review and/or amendments to your Regulation 123 list. As such, please add me to your database as the EFA contact for Local Plan and CIL consultations.
3. EFA have recently held discussions with officers from Guildford BC and Surrey CC regarding the potential for EFA to forward fund the provision of schools. We look forward to progressing these discussions with your officers for those sites/schools which will be secured by 2020.
4. Finally, I hope the above comments are helpful in shaping Guildford’s Local Plan Strategy and Sites, with particular regard the provision of land for new schools. I look forward to opportunities for EFA’s continued involvement in the Local Plan process.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp171/1254</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15805601 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Sir or madam)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new Transport Topic Paper has been published by GBC. Items 3.16 and 3.17 (page 10) mention Highways England concerns regarding the Strategic Highway Assessment Report 2016 and two letters. These letters can be accessed from the “Get Involved” website by searching for the Highways England response to the consultation. It seems clear that further modelling will be undertaken before the Examination and it also seems unlikely that it will be consulted on. We consider that any further modelling should include more detailed information so that it can be subject to scrutiny by GBC and the public.

The wording of Policy ID1 has been amended to give an impression that provision of adequate infrastructure will be enforced. However, the reality is that GBC will not determine the required infrastructure. It will be determined by Surrey Highways for the local road network and they are required to support development – not put obstacles in the way. If the Strategic Highway Assessment Report is anything to go by, the requirements will be understated or not even recognised.

Transport assessments supporting planning applications will be prepared by consultants acting for, and remunerated by, the applicant. Improvements to the strategic road network (e.g. A3) will be determined by Highways England, budget constraints, and ministerial decisions. Cllr Furniss has stated that the proposed Blackwell Farm development will not depend on A3 widening (in response to a question from Karen Stevens to the Executive Advisory Board meeting held on 20 April). It seems likely that Highways England have felt the need to offer a reality check on the likelihood of major work on the A3, such as widening or a tunnel, in the foreseeable future – apart from improvements to two slip roads. The policy states that infrastructure will be secured by planning condition and/or planning obligation but this will require enforcement and we doubt the ability and willingness of GBC to overcome developers’ viability arguments. For the permissions that require a longer timescale there could be non-delivery issues if the original developer abandons the project without fulfilling all the conditions and obligations.

Item 4.6.8 still indicates that GBC will be prepared to reduce infrastructure requirements by negotiation, i.e. viability for the developer will take precedence over infrastructure. No change has been made to the monitoring requirement which is based on CIL receipts and spending rather than actual, and timely, delivery of infrastructure.

We object to the new Guildford Borough Council Transport Strategy 2017.

We object to ASP 3 new A3/A3100/B2215/A247 Burpham-Burnt common all-movements junction, formed by a new connector road linking between new A3/A3100 Burpham junction (SRN4) and the B2215 London Road, in combination with the new A3 northbound on-slip (SRN9) and the new A3 southbound off-slip (SRN10) under Infrastructure and Delivery.

If development gets the go ahead for the strategic site at Gosden Hill it would be logical to construct a 4 way A3 interchange at Burpham. The A247 link road to Woking already at capacity will become gridlocked.

We object to SRN4 New A3/A3100 Burpham junction with relocated A3 southbound off-slip and new A3 southbound on-slip. This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 whereby traffic will be passing directly through Send from the A3 and M25 and the proposed new development at Wisley.
We object to SRN9 A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common) and SRN10 A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common). This will place an unbearable problem onto the A247 which is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17105  Respondent: 15922337 / Andrew Malcher  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Pyrford Green Belt Action Group objects to developments which will increase the volume of traffic

2.1 We object to developments causing increased traffic on motorways and arterial roads in Surrey. The M25 and A3 are already highly congested. Proposed developments, particularly at Wisley, would aggravate the position.

2.2 We object to developments which will increase the volume of traffic on minor roads and lanes. Pyrford, Send and Ripley already suffer from serious congestion on village roads. Developments proposed by Guildford Council will increase traffic across Newark Bridge in Ripley into Pyrford up the steep, narrow Church Hill and along Pyrford Common Road. This will increase noise and air pollution damage to Pyrford Common Site of Nature Conservation Importance, and the Wey Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area.

An increased number of commuters from proposed developments in Guildford will be attracted by the proximity of West Byfleet main line railway station, onto roads already forecast by Woking Council to be at the lowest flow capacity: Category F ie “forced or breakdown of flow” (effectively nose to tail).

Road traffic is a major cause of air and noise pollution and this damages people and wildlife inside and outside of Guildford Borough, including Pyrford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17202  Respondent: 15922337 / Andrew Malcher  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The local infrastructure is insufficient as it stands, due to increases in the local population. I have personal experience of waiting 5 hours in A&E for treatment. Children have to be driven to schools at a distance from their homes due to lack of local places. Roads are regularly at a standstill with ‘normal’ commuter traffic and gridlocked when there is an accident or some road works. Air pollution is responsible for many deaths each year. It would take many years of investment to bring infrastructure up to an acceptable level for the current population. Levies on developers will not remedy this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15575  Respondent: 15977889 / Charles Kimpton  Agent:
OBJECT. CIL wrongly encourages development on green field sites requiring heavy infrastructure investment. New developments need to be concentrated in urban areas close to shops and transport links.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. **Policy D1: infrastructure**

I OBJECT to the mismatch between the latest Plan’s ambitious development targets and that lack of any realistic plans for adequate infrastructure, as already highlighted in previous public consultations.

The Council have lately acknowledged that infrastructure is a constraint, and no-one expects all infrastructure to be pre-positioned before any development can take place. But the lack of any explanation as to how infrastructure improvements will, even roughly, be on the right scale is a giant hole in the Plan that invalidates most of its housing and other aspirations.

Policy D1’s assumption that the “infrastructure provider” will maintain infrastructure in most cases, and that developers will offer contributions via Community Infrastructure Levy, is inadequate. Deliberately setting out excessive development targets you know can never be met (and which create public alarm) is a planning failure that the Inspector should challenge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

1. I OBJECT to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned
growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure,
which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both
A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent
infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/238  Respondent: 17246945 / C Kurk  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

Having read your revised plan it appears that the only thing to happen is a very slight drop in number of new homes
proposed.

It still does not take into account lack of school places and medical appointments which are already at breaking point.

The infra structure cannot take the amount of extra traffic proposed. Parking is already a problem let alone moving round
in the area.

To put houses on at Wisley and to get them coming on at Ripley is total madness.

Junction 10 on the M25 is a black spot and very often is blocked as is the A3. The A3 has become due to volume of
traffic just like the M25.

We pass over the M25 nearly every day and it is always stuck and not moving one way or the other.

Trying to bring more traffic on at this junction seems a very bad idea, the whole of the area will grind to a halt.

Perhaps some of the land around Guildford would be a better idea. Shalford for instance has lots of areas which could be
built on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/268  Respondent: 17247169 / Ben Greaves  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (443 and 442)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5: "We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are
required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/278  Respondent: 17248705 / Sarah & Ray Relf  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The level of investment proposed in the plan seems unlikely to meet the already serious deficiencies in infrastructure across the borough, and where significant investment is specified in the Infrastructure Schedule, in many cases it is unclear whether public sector funding is going to become available to support it. Funding from developers for major infrastructure projects will is unlikely to be sufficient, but until such infrastructure is in place, many of the larger developments proposed in the Local Plan will be unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/304  Respondent: 17249601 / Penelope Moore  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/321  Respondent: 17256577 / Tina Makin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/344  Respondent: 17267393 / Steve Knight  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is vital that stringent measures are put in place to ensure that infrastructure improvements precede all new development. I feel that the GBC plans are still too weak. Infrastructure changes must be viewed borough wide and not in isolation. Our village of Jacobs Well already suffers from unacceptable traffic congestion (leading to delays), high air pollution levels, noise pollution and rat runs. The development of SARP, Wisley and Gosden Hill could place an unacceptable burden on the A320, Clay Lane, Jacobs Well Road and our village of Jacobs Well unless appropriate measures are taken. Flooding, both surface water and fluvial, is also an issue in our area which needs to be addressed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/359  Respondent: 17267745 / Maureen Knight  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is vital that stringent measures are put in place to ensure that infrastructure improvements precede all new development. I feel that the GBC plans are still too weak. Infrastructure changes must be viewed borough wide and not in isolation. Our village of Jacobs Well already suffers from unacceptable traffic congestion (leading to delays), high air pollution levels, noise pollution and rat runs. The development of SARP, Wisley and Gosden Hill could place an unacceptable burden on the A320, Clay Lane, Jacobs Well Road and our village of Jacobs Well unless appropriate measures are taken. Flooding, both surface water and fluvial, is also an issue in our area which needs to be addressed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits “…we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/497</th>
<th>Respondent: 17285857 / Network Rail (Daniel Chalk)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General**

On all land currently under Network Rail ownership then operational usage should be considered a priority. Access to the railway for operational use should also not be hindered or prevented by any development either on railway land or in land adjacent to the railway.

The cumulative effect of a number of developments in the same area should always be assessed to ensure that the appropriate CIL or Section 106 funds can be allocated to railway projects where there is a resultant impact from those developments.

As stated above, Network Rail are working closely with Guildford Borough Council to identify future land requirements around the Guildford Station area and develop a strategy that meets the needs of the railway and the wider community.

----------------------------------------

Network Rail is the statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the country’s railway infrastructure and associated estate. Network Rail owns, operates, maintains and develops the main rail network. This includes the railway tracks, stations, signalling systems, bridges, tunnels, level crossings, and viaducts.

Could you please ensure that the following comments are taken into account and included within the preparation of your forthcoming Local Plan:

Development proposals affecting the safety at level crossings are an extremely important consideration for Network Rail. As you will be aware the Local Planning Authority have a statutory responsibility under planning legislation (Schedule 5 (f)(ii) of the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure Order 2010) to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume of a material change in the character of the traffic using a level crossing over a railway.

Included below are sections from the House of Commons - Transport Committee - Eleventh Report - Safety at level crossings printed on the 24th February 2014.

The House of Commons - Transport Committee - Eleventh Report - Safety at level crossings states:
“Level crossings are a significant source of risk on the UK’s transport networks. Although the number of accidental deaths at level crossings has decreased in recent years, nine people died in 2012-13. Every one of those deaths was a personal tragedy which could have been averted. We recommend that the Office of Rail Regulation (ORR), which is responsible for rail safety, adopt an explicit target of zero fatalities at level crossings from 2020.”

“7. Level crossings are places where footpaths, bridleways or roads cross railway lines at the same level. Network Rail manages approximately 6,500 level crossings on the commercial rail network, and there are a further 1,500 crossings on heritage, industrial and metro railways.5 There are two general types of crossing: active crossings, which provide warnings or protection when a train is approaching, and passive crossings, which do not. Active protection may be automatic, or may require a signaler, driver or crossing keeper to perform certain actions. Passive crossings rely entirely on the user for their safe operation.”

“12. There are significant safety risks associated with the different forms of level crossing. Of Network Rail’s 6,500 crossings, 76% are passive crossings, which do not offer any warning of an approaching train (see Table 1). The decision on whether it is safe to cross is left to the user.”

In the recent report ‘Level Crossing Safety’ issued by the Transport Select Committee (Para 1 Pg 35) the following was stated that may be of use:- “Analysis of Network Rail and Department for Transport data shows that if an average walking trip includes a level crossing, the fatality risk to a pedestrian is about double the risk of an average walking trip without a level crossing.”

In relation to co-operation between railway operators, highway authorities and planning authorities:

“31. Local authorities must work with Network Rail and other railway operators to help keep level crossings safe. For example, local authorities’ plans for promoting walking and cycling routes that traverse level crossings can have a direct effect on safety at those crossings. However, the Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Planning and Transport told us that liaison between Network Rail and local authorities is variable…Network Rail has highlighted a number of examples where local authorities have imposed planning obligations on developers, to help fund Network Rail's construction of footbridges… However, in some cases planning authorities have consented to large developments and changes in road layout without due attention to the increased risk at nearby level crossings… In its report into a fatal accident at the Kings Mill No. 1 crossing near Mansfield, the RAIB (Rail Accident Investigation Branch) criticised the local authority for establishing a walking and cycling trail without discussing the likely impact on the usage of a level crossing with Network Rail.”

“32. Railway operators are already statutory consultees where proposed development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or character of traffic using a level crossing…The Law Commission's proposal for broader statutory duty of co-operation on railway operators, traffic authorities and highway authorities in respect of level crossings is a sensible suggestion….However, in the case of footpaths, private crossings or unadopted roads (which are not maintained by the highway authority), there is a case for adding planning authorities to that list…We welcome the duty of cooperation on railway operators, traffic authorities and highways authorities in respect of level crossings but recommend that it should also encompass planning authorities so that the impact of additional numbers of people using level crossings can be considered.”

We believe that proposals that impact upon level crossings should include S106 or CIL contributions to mitigate the impacts of those developments. Wherever possible Network Rail will seek closure of level crossings, and either replacement with a footbridge or inclusion of a diversionary route. We believe that S106 developer contributions should be used to fund footbridges and where this is not possible developer contributions should be used to fund any mitigation works at a level crossing as a result of increased type or volume of user. As Network Rail is funded by public remit we believe it is unreasonable to expect Network Rail to fund mitigation measures on railway infrastructure as a result of third party commercial development. We believe that the above comments should be integrated as policies within the Local Plan. Planning obligations for railway infrastructure should be included in the same manner as planning obligations for highways, local facilities etc. as developments can impact the railway and developer contributions should be levied to mitigate such impacts.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
- The scale of housing development at the four housing development sites remaining in this Local Plan will put too great a strain on local infrastructure. The approximately 2000 proposed homes at Wisley Airfield will put too great a strain on the local infrastructure. It is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and simply call them sustainable. Shifting to cycling and walking discriminates against vulnerable members of the community - the disabled, those with small children, the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill. Alternatives impact on already congested roads or over-subscribed peak hour rail services.

Building in and around East Horsley will destroy the culture and fabric of the village. The roads in the village are already congested without the additional new homes and subsequent increased usage. They are generally narrow, with potholes, cracks and other signs of wear. During heavy rains, the drains block and flooding results. The pavements do not run along every road through the village, and where they do, they are narrow and often cracked and uneven. It is a village; it was never designed to support a town.

The local primary school (the Raleigh) is already at capacity, resulting in local children being sent miles from their homes for schooling. In addition, Horsley Medical Centre is at capacity.

The proposals are unsustainable because they do not meet the objective of providing infrastructure to support the new homes. Nor do the proposals take any account of the strongly-held view (30,000 objections) that the Green Belt should be protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits…”we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and/or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)
The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** psp171/626  **Respondent:** 17296321 / Robyn Cormack  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits …”we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and /or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP, C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard
to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

**Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections**

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/630  **Respondent:** 17296417 / Simon Wilcockson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Although much is made of the need for new infrastructure to support these developments and for this to be in place as needed, the Plan admits “…*we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes*” and this is assuming all the infrastructure (listed in App. C to the Plan) is in place in a timely fashion. GBC has little or no
control over the plans of Surrey County Council as the local highways authority and Highways England for trunk roads. Worryingly, the Plan now has less substantive information about improvements to the A3 South of the M25 from Highways England and it appears that their plans are not yet formed (Policy ID2). In the absence of such information, the infrastructure proposed is specific to each proposed development and does not address cumulative effects. What would be the case with regard to planning approval if SCC and /or HE do not provide timely infrastructure?

The Plan now calls for nearly all infrastructure to be funded by developers (see APP. C). We question how realistic it is to expect developers not only to pay for all the infrastructure but also to have it in place in a timely fashion. The Plan says that planning permission will be refused if timely provision of infrastructure cannot be secured. Such refusals will almost certainly be settled in the courts. Developers’ business models are based on building and selling houses to create the cash to provide infrastructure. People will be living on the sites well before infrastructure is complete. Will GBC prevent development of Gosden Hill until slip roads etc. are provided off and onto the A3? Again, the infrastructure is site specific and does not address cumulative effects.

If development were to be refused the land would still have been removed from the green belt and its future rendered uncertain.

Residents are being asked to accept very large amounts of development with little or no detail being provided on measures which would relieve existing congestion and limit future problems. The cumulative effects of the developments listed below are certain to have a devastating effect on the A247 through our village (and of course on Send) and it is hard to see how any of the infrastructure proposed in the Plan (App. C) will do anything to mitigate the effects of these developments on the A247 and hence our village.

**Summary of the Impacts on the A247 – My Objections**

All of these developments will draw additional traffic to the A247 through the village. It would be naïve to think that the employment sites and schools will serve only the developments themselves. Apart from the normal movements of residents to and from the new sites there will be considerable additional traffic on the A247 generated by:

- children from elsewhere being delivered to schools and collected
- the employees of the offices and industrial sites getting to work and returning home
- the vehicle movements generated by distribution and storage activities
- traffic from Wisley wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to travel South and returning
- traffic from Slyfield wishing to travel South and returning
- private and commercial traffic originating in the South and accessing Gosden Hill, Burnt Common or the A3 and returning (including traffic from Dunsfold)

The A247 although an A road:

- is less than 2 vehicle wide in places
- does not have continuous footpaths
- has several sharp bends
- has a hump-backed bridge with poor site lines
- has a very difficult junction to access the station
- is largely unlit
- has a primary school
- is already very congested at times

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/724  Respondent: 17302497 / F Bennett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan."

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

The Garlich Arch, Burntcommon, Send & Wisley proposals will have a devestating affect on the quality of life, and pollution from the traffic it would generate, as all these developments will necessitate their traffic to be directed through Ripley, Ripley has already become a by pass for the A3, which on a daily basis has problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/739  Respondent: 17303553 / Anita Fitchie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy II. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.
There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp171/771</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>17303713 / Andrew Fitchie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.
Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/763</th>
<th>Respondent: 17303745 / Christine M Macnair</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** pslp171/867  **Respondent:** 17308705 / University of Surrey (University of Surrey.)  **Agent:** Terence O'Rourke (Steve Molnar)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Policy ID1: Infrastructure and delivery

Whilst supportive of the principle that development should be phased with delivery of infrastructure, the University notes that the delivery of the new homes proposed in the plan is urgent and pressing.

Strategic sites that have the ability to deliver some of their homes early should not be delayed unnecessarily if they can demonstrably be delivered in a way that takes account of infrastructure issues such as traffic generation and road capacity.

The Blackwell Farm allocation (Policy A26) is in a very sustainable location that offers significant opportunities in this regard, including the ability to link to the Sustainable Movement Corridor from west Guildford to the town centre; a new access to the A31 that can divert some traffic away from the A3; the ability to provide key worker homes for staff employed at the University of Surrey and other locations in the west Guildford area, such as the Royal Surrey County Hospital and the Surrey Research Park. This would reduce the trip generation and pressure on existing road infrastructure in the area. The phasing of development in conjunction with off site infrastructure provision/improvements needs to take this into account. Further information is provided in the PBA transport statement submitted with these comments.

The policy should include the following:

“`The phasing of development in conjunction with off site infrastructure provision/improvements will be considered on a site by site basis, acknowledging planned investments, the nature of the proposals and that there are sites that may be better placed to proceed in advance of others.”`

The University notes that various road improvements are proposed in the infrastructure schedule. The University considers that further details are needed of what is envisaged at each location. It is recognised that the IDP will evolve alongside the evidence base in terms of mitigation measures.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

See text above.

**Attached documents:** [Blackwell Park Local Plan Transport Statement for Reps 10 7 17[1].pdf](#) (754 KB)

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/920  **Respondent:** 17316257 / Neeley Jackson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:
"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp171/962  **Respondent:** 17323265 / Simon Owen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.
The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1)
The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)
The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.
10,000 homes within a 10 mile radius of Normandy I remain concerned about this proposal as in no way can the infrastructure in the area cope. If this really is to proceed then GBC must commit to putting in the infrastructure to support it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2777  Respondent: 17365633 / Diane Newton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

All of the above would create major traffic problems (we [send] have problems now) The proposed slip road from and to the A3 onto the Clandon Road is just madness.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1291  Respondent: 17366113 / E A and Brian Oliver  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

However our roads, sewage, power and water supplies struggle as is it, especially roads. With regular tail-backs on the A323 towards Ash and Puttenham Heath Road from the south in the afternoon and from the north in the morning. More building in areas around our village at Ash, Tongham and Blackwell Farm would exacerbate this and add to the misery of long delays, especially on the A31.

10,000 homes close by a village with narrow roads will be a nightmare as it is a rat run already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1321  Respondent: 17372769 / P Robertson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure
The A323 at Normandy reaches traffic gridlock in the evenings towards Ash/Aldershot and heavy traffic towards Guildford in the mornings. This will be further exacerbated as the new developments in Ash continue. This brings pollution and stress to the villages which means Westwood Lane, Glaziers Lane and Wyke Avenue become 'rat runs.'

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1393</th>
<th>Respondent: 17381825 / O J S Malhouse</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing has been put forward since last year's Consultation to improve the sustainability of the West Horsley development sites and thus meet National policy requirements. Every home on the West Horsley sites will need a minimum of one car to enable residents to get to shops, medical centre, library and Horsley Station, regardless of how much pressure is applied to adopt cycling and walking as the preferred means of travel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1474</th>
<th>Respondent: 17399681 / Anthony Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is virtually no infrastructure planning for sites A42, A43 and A44, which between them will have a serious impact on all local infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1478</th>
<th>Respondent: 17400065 / Diane Kett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to strongly express my objection for the proposed building on Gosden Farm. I don't think that Burpham as it is at present can possibly take the extra traffic that will come as a result of the new estate, park and ride, station etc. It will put another 3,000 to 4,000 cars on roads that already struggle especially during rush hours, when George Abbot school starts and finishes, when Aldi is busy or if there is a problem on the A3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree that there is a need for housing but Burpham cannot possibly take this large number of new houses. I do think members of the council should visit the road through Burpham and the slip road off the A3 at peak hours to see how bad it is already.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

East Horsley is a small village which does not have the infrastructure of roads, rail, parking, medical facilities or schooling to support such a huge increase in population. Fifty seven percent of new housing proposed is on land that is currently categorised as Green Belt. This is flouting government law which established Green Belt to protect the countryside for future generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

POLICY ID1 - Infrastructure and Delivery

3.64 The NPPF sets out at para 162 that:

Local planning authorities should work with other authorities and providers to:

• assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands

• take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their area

3.65 GVG recognises the vital importance of the new infrastructure that will be required to support and mitigate the impact of the growth set out in the Local Plan.

3.66 Paragraph 4.6.2 sets out the wider definition of Infrastructure under the Planning Act to include roads and other transport facilities, flood defences, schools and other educational facilities, medical facilities, sporting and recreational facilities, and open spaces, all of which are recognised and addressed within the GVG Masterplan.

3.67 The policies immediately following policy ID1 set out the strategy for road investment (ID2), sustainable transport (ID3), and green and blue infrastructure (ID4). However there is no other specific policy relating to other infrastructure, as defined under the Planning Act, to include flood defences, schools and other educational facilities, medical facilities, sporting and recreational facilities, and open spaces.

3.68 In relation to rail infrastructure, GVG, as part of its Plan, has produced detailed proposals for the station quarter which enhances the connection of the rail station to bus, road, rail, cycle and footpaths. GVG recognise the required 40% increase in capacity described in the Wessex Plan, Heathrow Southern Rail Access and other studies and has designed new platforms and a modern transport interchange for the future. Increases in services and new journey opportunities afforded by Guildford East and West Stations plus regular services to the villages south east of Guildford, Heathrow etc. will result in the rail station becoming an even more significant hub for the region. The GVG Plan includes detailed proposals for the rail station quarter which enhances the connection of the station to bus, road, rail, cycle and footpaths.

3.69 There is a requirement to consider other essential infrastructure if the Local Plan is to be found sound.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1763  Respondent: 17417985 / John Dumbleton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is generally accepted that at peak times the A3 around Guildford and local roads in Merrow and Burpham are performing at over capacity. Anyone who has experienced traffic congestion in this area knows that the level of growth planned for this area will undoubtedly make it even worse notwithstanding the proposed schemes to improve the highway network. The transport infrastructure is another constraint that has not been properly assessed even with all the proposed measures being proposed to alleviate congestion around Guildford which have themselves been watered down in this draft Plan.

Policy ID1 states that the delivery of development may need to be phased to reflect the delivery of infrastructure to be secured by planning condition and planning obligation. This approach is not strong enough. Site development should not be allowed to proceed unless strong and satisfactory guarantees or undertakings to provide the essential elements of the infrastructure needed have been given by developers and other bodies providing those elements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7486  Respondent: 17424705 / Keith Brothwell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

GP Surgery access

The SA states with regard to GP Surgery access that there ‘is little potential to conclude on the ability of surgeries to accept additional patients or expand.’ The surgery is already heavily subscribed. Pressures on local GPs are mounting as other national considerations take hold. The SA continues by stating that ‘the proposed allocation at Send Marsh / Burnt Common (400 homes) potentially stands out as being some distance from a GP surgery.’ The plan does not contain any firm commitment for sustainable transport from the proposed development areas to GP surgeries, should there be room for the large number of young people expected to take up residence (400 x 3 people per house = 1200 new patients).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1973  Respondent: 17433409 / Julie Iles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I also have concerns about the delivery of infrastructure to support improvements which are required as a direct result of new housing, for example new A3 slip roads at Burntcommon. Whilst I welcome developer funded commitments for road network improvements I am concerned that this will lead to a reduction of any affordable housing which will be delivered. This concern reflects a change in Section 4.2.40, where there seems to be some softening of the language around the issue of developers needing to demonstrate lack of economic viability of affordable homes in order to reduce their standard quota (40%). This concern applies to other developer funded projects including Wisley cycle networks.

I welcome the change in language suggesting that Rural Exception Homes (Section 4.2.46) now need to ‘meet the housing needs of the local community’. In village settings across The Horsleys, the definition of ‘the local community’ should be those living and working within the village, and I would expect a high level of consultation with villagers as well as the Parish Council and reference to Neighbourhood Plans such as that formally submitted to Guildford Borough Council by Effingham Parish Council to influence any such projects.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2090  Respondent: 17443745 / Robert Siaens  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Unless an efficient new junction with 4-way access to and from the A3 is included, all traffic from any development heading south onto the A3 will have to go towards town to access it, further clogging up Guildford’s already dire traffic problems. Guildford’s traffic problems HAVE TO BE addressed first and foremost to alleviate this awful problem, which is currently reducing the quality of life in this otherwise wonderful town. And all these problems are contributing to a worsening pollution problem in Burpham and Guildford, to which the proposed new housing on Gosden Hill farm will only contribute.

The A3 HAS TO BE sorted out, improvements carried out and, more than anything else, a tunnel planned to eliminate the bottleneck at the Cathedral junction during rush hours or when an accident happens. I consider this to be vital to the traffic flow and consequent wellbeing of our traffic congested town!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2130  Respondent: 17445345 / Albury Parish Council (Joanna Cadman)  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We support policy IDI (3) that states that improvements to infrastructure must go hand in hand with development and not lag behind, though this statement is contradicted in the Plan under point 4:1:9 which states that infrastructure changes won’t happen until the end of the plan in 2033-34.

We ask that Guildford Borough Council in its plans for infrastructure are mindful of building in nearby Boroughs including Waverley, and their impact on resources. Substantial new housing is to be built at Cranleigh, Dunsfold airfield, and Godalming. This will impact Albury adversely if commuters and visitors to the AONB are allowed to use the A248 in its current site running through the centre of Albury village.
1. The ESFA is supportive of the proposed changes to the Local Plan with regard to planning proactively for the provision of new schools.
2. The ESFA welcomes the addition of para 4.6.49a recognising that national planning policy requires great weight to be given to the need to create, expand or alter schools to meet the needs of existing and proposed communities. This was a point we highlighted in our response to the 2016 consultation document.
3. The ESFA supports the clarification of requirements regarding secondary school provision in policies A25 and A26; and the clarification of requirements for developer contributions towards education provision in policy A29.
4. The clarification of education infrastructure requirements, including delivery agents, costs and funding sources in the Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) is also supported. This is important to ensure that developers have a clear understanding of the requirements placed on them to deliver this critical supporting infrastructure. It also provides clarity for the Local Education Authority and Department for Education as to what infrastructure is anticipated to be needed and when, aiding a coordinated approach to forward planning and delivery.
5. Lastly, the ESFA welcomes the addition of a reference to the council’s ‘Education Review’ document (May 2016) in the Evidence base section (Appendix D), a key evidence base document that we highlighted in our previous comments. If this is updated prior to the Strategy and Sites examination we would request sight of this once published.

**Conclusion**

1. I hope the above comments are helpful in shaping Guildford borough’s Local Plan, with specific regard to the provision of land for new schools.
2. Please notify the ESFA when the Local Plan is submitted for examination, the Inspector’s report is published and the Local Plan is adopted.
3. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries regarding this response.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: psip171/2224  Respondent: 17452289 / Chris Palmer  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Right now, Guildford is near to full. Congestion in the town centre, and on all roads leading to it, is legendary particularly at peak times. It will only take a very small increase to tip the scales and make it horrible. At peak times it is already...
common for appointments to be missed, and for people to abandon their trips. Adding over 13000 more homes will make that so much worse still, effectively wrecking Guildford as a quality place to live.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2445  Respondent: 17462113 / Ian Whitby  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Traffic congestion on the major roads west of Guildford is already at levels which significantly impact the lives of people living in the Ash Green area. A high volume of traffic passes through Ash Green each day to get onto the Hogs Back and as your Local Plan points out:

“2.14a Significant, recurrent traffic congestion is experienced during peak hours on the A3 trunk road, both as it runs through the urban area of Guildford, with queuing extending back onto the dual carriageway section of the eastbound A31,”

The additional housing proposed in the Local Plan will significantly add to traffic levels. Delays of 30 minutes are already common at the A31 / A3 junction. How can it be acceptable that the borough’s roads are already recognised as an impediment to business traffic to London and the M25 and yet it more houses are being proposed?

- The minor roads in Ash Green are already overcrowded with traffic volumes they were not designed to accommodate. I live on Ash Green Road, which acts as a “rat run” for commuters seeking to miss out the railway crossing at Ash station. The level crossing at Ash is closed for 35 minutes in each hour at peak times. The consequence is that roads such as Ash Green Road see excessive volumes of traffic during the morning and evening periods. Typical traffic rates are a car every 5 seconds for 2 days at each end of the day- on a road with no pavement, cars parked outside homes, a poorly maintained road surface and a humpback bridge and dangerous T-junction.

Adding more houses in this area will flood roads such as this with more traffic than they can possible handle and ruin the lives of those who live in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2599  Respondent: 17463841 / The Earl of Onslow and the Trustees of the Clandon Estate  Agent: WYG Planning (Sarah Evans)
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure and Delivery Section: Policies ID1-4 + Site Allocations A1-59

2.29 The changes made to the Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) cast significant doubts on the deliverability and viability of both the Local Plan itself and the large allocated sites (which account for 64% of the anticipated housing supply).
2.30 Appendix C contains the “key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the plan depends”. It is critical therefore that the infrastructure can be delivered on time and financed as per the detailed schedules. By definition, if it is not possible now to guarantee that the infrastructures as listed can all be delivered and funded on time then the plan will have failed its objective of identifying a confirmed number of homes to be delivered.

2.31 In assessing whether this infrastructure is likely to be delivered, it is salient to look at the total cost of the proposed key works as no total is included in the schedule.

- Transport Rail (NR1 - NR6): £155 million to be funded by Network Raid and Developer funded (with £20 million being specific developer funding contributing to NR1 (£100 million)).
- Transport Strategic Roads (SRN1 - SRN10): £334.1 million to £784.1 million to be funded by Highways England and Developer funded (with £30 million being specific developer funded as well as developer funding contributing to the £300 million to £750 million required for SRN2 / SRN3 / SRN5).
- Transport Local Road Networks (LRN1 - LRN25): £87.6 million to £102.6 million to be funded mainly by the developers (£73 million to £88 million).
- Park and Ride (P&R1): £7.5 million to be funded by the developers.
- Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC1 - SMC6): £80 million to £90 million to be funded by the developers and the local growth fund.
- Bus Transport (BT1 - BT2): £5.25 million to £10.25 million to be developer funded.
- Bus Transport (BT3 - BT6): Not yet costed - to be developer funded.
- Active Modes (AM1 - AM3): £26.7 million - to be developer funded with contributions from local growth fund and surrey county council
- Electricity and Gas: (EG1) £30 million - to be funded by UK Power networks, SSE and developer funded
- Electricity and Gas: (EG2 - EG7) - Cost to be determined but likely to be significant to be funded by developers and UKPN.
- Water Supply: (WS1 - WS5) - Cost to be determined and funded by developers.
- Wastewater connections and treatment: (WCT1 - WCT6) - Cost to be determined and funded by developers and Thames Water.
- Flood risk reduction: (FRR1 - FRR3) - Cost to be determined and funded by developers
- SANG1 - SANG 12 - £62 million plus cost of SAN 9-SANG 12 to be determined and funded by developers.
- Open Space (OS1 - OS6) - Cost to be determined and funded by developers
- Education (EYED2) - Cost to be determined and funded by developers
- Primary Schools (PED 2 - PED7) - £24 million plus costs to be determined for PED6 / PED7 and funded by developers.
- Secondary Schools (SED1 - SED5) - £50 million plus costs to be determined for SED5 and funded by developers.
- Emergency services (ES1) - £100 million to be developer funded.
- Health and social care (HSC1 - HSC6) - yet to be fully costed and contributions from developers to be determined.
- Community Facilities include:
  - CMH1 to CMH3 - cost to be determined and developer funded
  - Waste transfer facility (SARP 1 - SARP3): £270 million loan to be repaid by developer (or alternatively £90 million depending on how the schedule is interpreted).

2.32 The reason for listing the above in detail is so that the total costs can be assessed and considered whether they are realistic and can be funded by developers/relevant authorities, rather than at the expense of the public purse.

2.33 First, it is not possible to provide an overall total as many material items have not had a cost determined yet. It is difficult to understand how the Plan can be approved and considered sound, deliverable and effective without knowing the full costs and how they will be funded.

2.34 However, the above figures show (taking the maximum number when a range is shown) of £1.712 billion and this excludes those items above which are yet to be costed and which will increase this amount significantly. It is not at all clear that these costs can be funded.

2.35 In particular consideration needs to be given to the cost of the projects which is anticipated are to be funded by Highways England and the developers. Highways England are dealt with separately, and this next section deals with the funding that it is anticipated will be met by the Developers.
2.36 Unfortunately, Appendix C does not provide sufficient detail to ascertain what the total commitment of the developers will be because (i) some of the items are not fully costed, and (ii) some of the items identify that a contribution will be required from the developers without specifying what that cost will be. It is clear though that the developers of the allocated sites will be required to make enormous contributions which (given the qualification mentioned above) can be summarised as follows:

- **Transport Rail**: £20 million being specific developer funded as well as developer funding contributing to NR1 (£100 million).
- **Transport Strategic Roads**: £30 million being specific developer funded as well as developer funding contributing to SRN2 / SRN3 / SRN5 (£300 million to £750 million).
- **Transport Local Road Networks (LRN1 - LRN25)**: £73 million to £88 million to be funded by the developers.
- **Park and Ride (P&R1)**: £7.5 million to be funded by the developers.
- **Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC1 - SMC6)**: £80 million to £90 million to be funded by the developers (assuming only modest contribution from the local growth fund).
- **Bus Transport (BT1 - BT2)**: £5.25 million to £10.25 million to be developer funded.
- **Bus Transport (BT3 - BT6)**: Not yet costs - to be developer funded.
- **Active Modes (AM1 - AM3)**: £26.7 million - to be developer funded with contributions from local growth fund and surrey county council
- **Electricity and Gas**: (EG1) £30 million - to be funded by UK Power networks, SSE and developer funded
- **Electricity and Gas**: (EG2 - EG7) - Cost to be determined but likely to be significant to be funded by developers and UKPN.
- **Water Supply**: (WS1 - WS5) - Cost to be determined and funded by developers.
- **Wastewater connections and treatment**: (WCT1 - WCT6) - Cost to be determined and funded by developers and Thames Water.
- **Flood risk reduction**: (FRR1 - FRR3) - Cost to be determined and funded by developers
- **SANG1 - SANG 12**: £62 million plus cost of SAN 9-SANG 12 to be determined and funded by developers.
- **Open Space (OS1 - OS6)** - Cost to be determined and funded by developers.
- **Education (EYED2)** - Cost to be determined and funded by developers
- **Primary Schools (PED 2 - PED7)** - £24 million plus costs to be determined for PED6 / PED7 and funded by developers.
- **Secondary Schools (SED1 - SED5)** - £50 million plus costs to be determined for SED5 and funded by developers.
- **Emergency services (ES1)** - £100 million to be developer funded.
- **Health and social care (HSC1 - HSC6)** - yet to be fully costed and contributions from developers to be determined.
- **Community Facilities include**:
  - **CMH1 to CMH3** - cost to be determined and developer funded
  - **Waste transfer facility (SARP 1 - SARP3)**: £270 million loan to be repaid by developer (or alternatively £90 million depending on how the schedule is interpreted).

2.37 As mentioned above, Appendix C does not allow a specific number to be attached to the “developers’ financial obligation” but even taking a prudent assessment of the figures above, the total appears to be likely to be well in excess of £500 million (if the waste transfer facility costs is £90 million in aggregate) and £700 million (if the waste transfer facility costs are £270 million in aggregate).

2.38 The majority of these costs will have to be met by the large strategic sites. Therefore (if affordable homes are to be excluded) the developers will have to contribute significantly more that £100,000 per home (and maybe closer to £150,000 per home) as their contribution towards the infrastructure costs. This is considered excessive and considerably more than comparative figures for any other boroughs that have undertaken local plans.

2.39 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is clear that many of the costs of the infrastructure necessary to support the Plan are still unknown. The IDP also highlights that much of how the infrastructure will be funded is also unknown. We consider that there is not sufficient information regarding the cost of infrastructure and how this will be secured to result in a viable IDP. This undermines the soundness of the Local Plan.

2.40 It is a statutory requirement that all designated sites are viable and specifically (to quote from the glossary of terms) that “a site is said to be viable if after taking account of all costs it provides a competitive return to the developer and generates a land value sufficient to persuade the land owner to sell the land for the development proposed”. It seems unlikely that all (or indeed any of) the allocated sites are viable given the infrastructure burden imposed upon them.
2.41 Furthermore, it is unclear from the Local Plan what assurances the Council has obtained that the developers will be able to provide the funding both with regards to quantum and timing.

2.42 As is made clear in the Local Plan, it is necessary for all the infrastructure to either be built before the development can commence or adequate financial guarantees obtained that any future commitments will be funded. It would have been helpful if the Local Plan had confirmed the due diligence that has been undertaken to ensure that the appropriate funding / guarantees will be available on the required timetable.

2.43 In our July 2016 representations, we flagged the above issues in outline and confirmed that the Onslow Park site had very few infrastructure requirements. This has further been confirmed by Highways England and Surrey County Council.

2.44 It remains therefore our position that a number of the sites proposed for allocation, particularly those in less sustainable locations, have material problems associated with regards to suitability, sustainability, viability and deliverability and that the changes made to this iteration of the plan have not adequately addressed these concerns. Those that are urban extensions bear an infrastructure burden compounded by the less sustainable sites and suggests that a more considered spatial strategy that focuses on minimising infrastructure requirements and targeting such investment in or adjacent to the urban area would provide a more sustainable approach.

**Infrastructure and Delivery Section (Highways England): Policies ID1-4 + A1-59**

2.45 Furthermore, the changes to the Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) show that it is proposed that Highways England will fund several projects (with a possible cost per appendix C of up to £755 million). Highways England have as of today only approved to fund one of the projects and it seems unlikely they will be able to fund the other projects given the quantum requested and the funds available to Highways England.

2.46 The costs in appendix C which have been allocated to Highways England totals between £305 million and £755 million. It is surprising that there is such a large range in the costs. The pertinent points to note here are as follows:

2.47 In a meeting of the Guildford Borough, Economy and Infrastructure Executive Advisory Board held on 9th January 2017, the Board received a presentation from Hugh Coakley (Project Manager, Highways England) and Graham Bown (Atkins Global, consultant for Highways England) about the possible options for improving junction 10 of the M25. This confirmed that SRN5 (the A3 / M25 works) were planned to be undertaken with completion scheduled for 2023 (not 2022 shown in Appendix C).

2.48 However, the key points to note are that Highways England confirmed in the meeting that these were the only works authorised to be undertaken during the period to 2023.

2.49 The minutes record that the Board “were disappointed that improvements to the A3 at Guildford had no definite timescale”.

2.50 The minutes further record that the Guildford Borough, Economy and Infrastructure Executive Advisory Board noted that they “feared that existing levels of congestion around Guildford would be worsened when junction 10 was finished.”

2.51 It is therefore reasonable to question, given this concern, why this draft of the Local Plan has included strategic sites which will add to the A3 congestion level around Guildford.

2.52 The most recent Annual Report and Accounts of Highways England to 31st March 2016 confirms that the M25 / A3 junction works are the only authorised works that have been approved (see page 40 committed projects) in the next five years from the date of that report.

2.53 There is therefore a material doubt that SRN2 and SRN3 can or will be funded by Highways England within the timetable shown, or indeed ever, and in the meantime, there is likely to be more congestion around Guildford.

2.54 As a result of the above, it would seem sensible to review the proposed strategic sites, all of which increase traffic and put pressure on the A3 and M25.
2.55 If, as may well be the case, Highways England do not approve any further works other than the A3 / M25 junction works then the strategic sites cannot be developed and the Plan cannot be delivered and therefore is likely to be found unsound.

2.56 The proposed cost that Highways England is being requested to fund in Appendix C could total £755 million on four separate road improvement schemes. This figure needs to be put into the context of an annual spend on road improvements by Highways England in the whole of England in the year to 31st March 2016 of £1.1 billion (source: The Annual Report and Accounts of Highways England to 31st March 2016 - section 6 page 28). The local plan envisages that two of the road improvement works (cost up to £500 million) will be financed by Highways England prior to 2022 with the other 2 projects being completed before 2027. It seems highly unlikely that Highways England will be able to allocate such large sums to these local projects as it would involve a disproportionate amount of each annual budget being allocated to these road improvements over a number of years. Indeed, Highways England would seem to have effectively confirmed this in their presentation to the Guildford Borough, Economy and Infrastructure Executive Advisory Board held on 9th January 2017 referenced above.

2.57 Onslow Park has no significant strategic highways or infrastructure requirements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 170724_Onslow_Park_Reps_targeted_consultation_on_LP_with_app.pdf (2.4 MB)
As you will be aware, Thames Water are the statutory sewerage undertaker for the whole of the Guildford Borough and the statutory water undertaker for the southern part of the Borough and are hence a “specific consultation body” in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. We commented on the previous version of the submission Local Plan in July 2016, therefore the following comments relate to the amended policies only as requested:

Policy ID1: Infrastructure and delivery

Thames Water still support the amended Policy I1 (now Policy ID1) and supporting text in principle as it is largely in line with previous representations, but consider that the additional text on water/wastewater infrastructure should still be included.

Thames Water support the Policy in principle as a key sustainability objective for the preparation of the new Local Plan should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes specific guidance on water and sewerage infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the NPPF states: “Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:……the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater….”

Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: “Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment…..take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.”

The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in March 2014 includes a section on ‘water supply, wastewater and water quality’ and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that “Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development” (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).

Thames Water support the identification of water supply and waste water treatment infrastructure at paragraph 4.6.3, but given the importance of such infrastructure to sustainable development, it is considered that text along the following lines should be also included to support Policy ID1: “The Council will seek to ensure that there is adequate water supply, surface water, foul drainage and waste water treatment capacity to serve all new developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity and surface water drainage both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing wastewater/sewerage infrastructure. Drainage on the site must maintain separation of foul and surface flows. Where there is an infrastructure capacity constraint the Council will require the developer to set out what appropriate improvements are required and how they will be delivered.

The development or expansion of water supply or waste water treatment facilities will normally be supported, either where needed to serve existing or proposed new development, or in the interests of long term water supply and waste water management, provided that the need for such facilities outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impact that any such adverse impact is minimised.”

Site Allocations

Specific Water Supply and Sewerage/Wastewater Infrastructure Comments:

Water treatment and wastewater/sewage treatment capacity maybe a constraint in some catchments within the Guildford Borough area. As the Local Plan is finalised we will be reviewing which of our treatment sites need upgrades to accommodate the growth and we are willing to have a meeting with the Council to discuss this.
The attached updated table provides Thames Water’s site specific comments from desktop assessments on water supply and sewerage/wastewater infrastructure in relation to the proposed housing sites, but more detailed modelling may be required to refine the requirements.

These sites have been assessed on an individual base with only limited opportunity to consider cumulative impacts. Therefore, the impact of multiple sites in the same area coming forward may have a greater impact. The scale, location and time to deliver any required network upgrades will be determined after receiving a clearer picture of the location, type and scale of development together with its phasing.

Where we have identified sites where drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development, in the first instance a drainage strategy would be required from the developer to determine the exact impact on our infrastructure and the significance of the infrastructure required to support the development in line with the Core Strategy Policy IN2: Water Supply and Wastewater.

It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our sewerage network assets being required, up to three years lead in time is usual to enable for the planning and delivery of the upgrade. As a developer has the automatic right to connect to our sewer network under the Water Industry Act we may also request a drainage planning condition if a network upgrade is required to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation of the development. This will avoid adverse environmental impacts such as sewer flooding and / or water pollution.

[See other comments for site specific comments]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/3266  Respondent: 17580289 / Linda Carter  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The 2017 Plan makes a stronger case for the delivery of infrastructure for all new developments. However given the number of statutory bodies involved in its provision, and it being dependent on planning being granted, details seem piecemeal, non-existent or not developed properly.

For example ID1, the proposed construction of slip roads onto A3 at Ripley, Send and Burpham as part of the site allocations at Wisley Airfield, Garlick Arch and Gosden Hill Farm (all in an 8 mile stretch from A3/M25 to Burpham) has not taken into consideration the repercussions on the local roads of the adjacent villages, already congested and poorly maintained.

In policy ID3 there is a strong suggestion that walking and cycling are sustainable modes of transport in outlying rural areas where roads are already congested and poorly lit. This is not a realistic proposition, nor practical. Also, a suggested provision of a bus network, whilst ideal, is unlikely to be economic in the long-term and therefore unsustainable.

I object to Policy ID.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/3377  Respondent: 17630465 / Sussex and Surrey Police (Andrew Taylor)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID1
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

To ensure our representations are as concise as possible we have only responded to those parts of the new Local Plan that directly relate to the priorities of Surrey Police to reduce crime and opportunities for crime in in the Borough, whether this be existing or new development.

The emerging local plan should include sound policy to reduce opportunities for crime and disorder to ensure the local plan is fully compliant with paragraphs 17, 58, 69, 70, 156, 162, and 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Providing a sound basis for crime prevention within adopted planning policy will improve the quality of new development and ensure the advice provided by our crime prevention design advisors is supported by development control officers and adopted by all future applicants.

Chapter 3: Spatial Vision – page 21

Strategic objective 3 – page 24

Surrey Police welcome the support and inclusion of ‘Strategic objective 3’ requiring all development to be of high quality design and enables people to live safe, healthy and active.

lifestyles. This is drafted in line with paragraph 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that planning policies should aim to achieve places which promote safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

This policy would be furthered strengthened through direct references to ‘Secured by Design’ and reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. In so doing, it would bring the Spatial Vision into closer alignment with Policy D4 (Character and design of new development).

Surrey Police strongly recommend the addition of the following Strategic objective under the heading of ‘Society’.

- Reducing crime, anti-social behaviour and the perception of crime through the application of Secured by Design standards and attaining the Secured by Design award. (recommended wording)

Furthermore, National Planning Practice Guidance is very clear that:

‘Designing out crime and designing in community safety should be central to the planning and delivery of new development. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires all local authorities to exercise their functions with due regard to their likely effect on crime and disorder, and to do all they reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder. The prevention of crime and the enhancement of community safety are all matters that a local authorities should consider when exercising its planning functions under the Town and Country Planning legislation.

Local Authorities may, therefore, wish to consider how they consult their Police and Crime Commissioners on planning applications where they are Statutory Consultees and agree with their police force how they will work effectively together on planning matters.

It is important that crime reduction-based planning measures are based upon a clear understanding of the local situation, avoiding makings assumptions about the problems and their causes. Consideration also needs to be given to how planning policies relate to wider policies on crime reduction, crime prevention and sustainable communities. This means working closely with the police force to analyse and share relevant information and good practice.’

(Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 26-011-20140306)

Strategic objective 12 – page 26

Surrey Police are concerned over the existing core theme regarding infrastructure and the limited detail relating to other infrastructure providers with the exception of transport. There is no recognition to emergency services within strategic objective 12 or 13. Improving health, education, life-long learning and well-being of all sectors of the community will not be achieved if that same community us not safe, secure and does not have adequate access to the emergency services.
In this respect, the Council’s attention is drawn to the fact that there is a significant body of Secretary of State and Planning Inspectorate decisions supporting the principle of developer contributions towards policing to mitigate against housing growth. These decisions can be summarised in Appendix 1.

Surrey Police consider that the current lack of reference to specific infrastructure providers is inconsistent with paragraphs 17, 58, 69, 70, 156, 177 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

To address these concerns, Surrey Police proposed strategic objective 12 is replaced with the following:

12. To facilitate the timely provision of social and physical infrastructure necessary to improve health, education, life-long learning, well-being, safety and security of all sectors of the community.

And / or

‘Linking new development where appropriate, to the improvement of health, education, life-long learning and the emergency services.

Policy ID1: Infrastructure and delivery – page 122

Policy ID1 outlines the infrastructure necessary to support development and mitigate its otherwise adverse impacts. Policy ID1 does not state which types of infrastructure will be supported, however further explanation is given in the subsequent ‘definitions’ section.

Guidance note 4.6.2 does states “Infrastructure is a very broad term. The Planning Act 2008 as amended defines infrastructure as roads and other transport facilities, flood defences, schools and other educational facilities, medical facilities, sporting and recreational facilities, and open spaces. Guidance on the CIL also advises that infrastructure also includes cultural and sports facilities, district heading schemes, police stations and other community facilities.

The definition of policing infrastructure is however far more broad than ‘police stations’ and encapsulates a wide variety of infrastructure necessary for policing. For this reason, Surrey Police request ‘police station’ is replaced by ‘police infrastructure’.

Nationally, the Force ensure we take regular legal advice and guidance from industry professionals on the applicability of NPPF tests relating to the application of Regulation 122 on our funding requests for S106 agreements and Infrastructure Delivery Plans. This included advice as to what is infrastructure which can be summarised as follows:

- The first point to note is that “infrastructure” is not a narrowly defined term. Section 216 of the Planning Act 2008 provides a list of “infrastructure” but is clear that that list is non-exhaustive. That fact is demonstrated by the use of the word “includes” prior to the list being set out.

- There is no difficulty in the proposition that contributions towards Police infrastructure can be within the definition of infrastructure for the purposes of the 2008 Act. In policy terms this is reinforced by the reference to security infrastructure in paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- Infrastructure is not limited to buildings and could include equipment such as vehicles, communications technology, and surveillance infrastructure such as CCTV.

Assessing the impact of housing growth in Guildford on policing capacity and police infrastructure

The emerging Guildford Local Plan makes provision for at least 12,426 homes in Guildford between 2015 and 2034 (an average of 654 homes a year), which will accommodate 31,562 additional persons at various allocated sites (based on 2011 census average household size).

Surrey Police records indicate that there were a total of 28,190 incidents recorded between the beginning of April 2016 and the end of March 2017. Of these incidents there were 8,520 recorded crimes which is only 28% of all recorded incidents. This results in approximately 0.508 incidents per household in the Borough or 0.2 incidents per person that require a police response in Guildford over the past year. The growth outlined in the emerging local plan would result in
an additional 6,312 incidents each year to be investigated (once full occupation is achieved). The number of recorded incidents would rise by approximately 332 incidents per year.

On average each police officer in Guildford attends approximately 141 incidents per year. These incidents range widely in complexity because of the statutory duties placed on the police force to respond to vulnerable persons. Surrey Police deliver crime prevention and presence, attendance and service lead at emergencies (e.g. traffic accidents, flooding, counter terrorism and community reassurance. We must also attend all incidents involving deaths, attend and input to community safety and crime partnerships, and provide referral responses when there are expressed concerns about the safety of children, the elderly and those with special needs. Common day-to-day incidents involve the detection and apprehension of intoxicated drivers, burglaries, various types of assault or domestic incidents and many more incidents which require police attention.

The emerging Local Plan proposes a significant increase to the housing stock of Guildford. This will be achieved through developing a range of strategic green and brownfield sites including Wisley Airfield. There is relatively little demand for emergency services from what are, in many cases, open fields or brownfield sites. Following redevelopment of these sites for housing and other uses, Surrey Police will have permanent, on-going demands placed upon our service. Ensuring Surrey Police are supported with the appropriate capital infrastructure to police these new developments is an essential planning policy consideration to be addressed in the emerging Local Plan and the subsequent Community Infrastructure Levy.

These additional crime, anti-social behaviour incidents and public safety/welfare incidents will translate into the following day-to-day impacts upon Surrey Police:

- Additional calls and response per year via the police control centre;
- Additional non-emergency events to follow up with public contact each year;
- Attendance to additional emergency events within areas of new development each year;
- Additional anti-social events to follow up with public contact each year;
- Increased demand for patrol cover including investment in new vehicles and other modes of transport for police officers;
- Additional demand for ANPR technologies (vehicles enabled or fixed site);
- Additional demands for new officers which incurs significant start-up costs through equipment and start-up training costs;
- Additional space in custody suites and other specialist policing functions;

The Council can be assured that the provision of new infrastructure to support the emergency facilities is supported by judgements from the High Court and appeal decisions made by the Secretary of State and Planning Inspectors. The following section outlines some of the key High Court rulings which set the legal principle of contributions towards policing.

**High Court and appeal decision in favour of developer contributions towards policing**

The principle of developer contributions towards policing has been tested in two notable High Court challenges ([Appendix 2 & 3](#)). There are also numerous appeal decisions in favour of developer contributions included the recent positive Secretary of State decision ([Appendix 4](#)) in favour of our partner force, Sussex Police.

The principle of developer contributions towards police infrastructure (and the definition of infrastructure) to support development growth was recently upheld by the High Court (22/11/16), in the case of Jelson Limited vs Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Hinkley and Bosworth Borough Council [2016] EWHC 2979 (Admin). As copy of this judgement is attached as Appendix 2. This High Court judgement included the following items as capital infrastructure considered necessary to support policing and confirming all items of infrastructure were fully compliant with CIL Regulation 122:

- Personal equipment (workstation, radios, protective equipment, uniforms, bespoke one-off training)
- Police vehicles
Jelson Limited’s argument against the police contribution are contained in paragraphs 73-76 of the enclosed High Court judgment. In summary, Jelson Limited argued the following:

- As the population of an area increased so the overall rate of crime in a police area, and hence the demands placed upon resources, declined.
- The Planning Inspector had not properly assessed the evidence submitted by Leicestershire Police. Has the Inspector done so, she would have rejected Leicestershire Police’s Section 106 contribution request.

Mr Justice Green wholly rejected Jelson’s case, as detailed in paragraphs 77-81 of the judgement. In summary, Mr Justice Green stated:

- The data submitted by Leicestershire Police did establish that the proposed development would have direct, additional and permanent demands upon policing services of all kinds.
- It was unreasonable to have expected the Inspector to undertake a more detailed analysis of the submissions from Leicestershire Police than she had done.
- The request made by Leicestershire Police was clear, with the continuous requested properly allocated to specific projects.
- The police evidence comprehensively demonstrated and evidenced the impact caused by the development and why the infrastructure types (and contributions) identified would mitigate this.
- In view of the above, the Inspector could have made no other reasonable choice but to award the requested Section 106 contributions to Leicestershire Police.

The case for developer contributions towards policing was tested prior to the Jelson case in The Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire vs Blaby Council and Hallam Land (and other developers). Mr Justice Foskett made some obliter observations in the case that are relevant and applicable to the principle of contributions towards policing infrastructure:

61. I do not, with respect, agree that the challenge mounted by the Claimant in this case can be characterised as a quibble about a minor factor. Those who, in due course, purchase properties on this development, who bring up children there and who wish to go about their daily life in a safe environment, will want to know that the police service can operate efficiently and effectively in the area. That would plainly be the “consumer view” of the issue. The providers of the service (namely, the Claimant) have statutory responsibilities to carry out and, as the witness state of the Chief Constable makes clear, that itself can be a difficult objective to achieve in these financially difficult time. Although the sums at stake for the police contributions will be small in comparison to the huge sums that will be required to complete the development, the sums are large from the point of view of the police.

62. I am incline to the view that if a survey of local opinion were taken, concerns would be expressed if it were thought that the developers were not going to provide the police with a sufficient contribution to its funding requirements to meet the demands of policing the new area: lawlessness in one area can have effects in another nearby area.

Sussex and Surrey Police have adopted the same methodology considered in these High Court decisions which uses a detailed assessment of existing resources to determine our predicted infrastructure requirements. These judgments confirm the reasonableness of Surrey Police seeking infrastructure contributions from new major developments to mitigate the negative impacts they cause. This view has been supported by the Secretary of State and Planning Inspectorate on numerous occasions which are included as Appendix 1.
Surrey Police would also like to draw the Council's attention in particular to the following comments of the Inspector in the Land at Melton Road Appeal (APP/X2410/A/12/2173673) as they are particularly resonant:

“It seems to me that the introduction of additional population and property to an area must have an impact on policing, in the same way as it must on education and library services, for example. Moreover, it also seems to me that the twelfth core planning principle of the Framework, that planning should… “take account of and support local strategies to improve health, Social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs”, can only be served if policing is adequate to the additional burdens imposed upon it on the same way as any other public service.

The logic of this is inescapable. Section 8 of the Framework concerns the promotion of healthy communities and planning decision, according to paragraph 69 should aim to achieve places which promote, inter alia, “safe and accessible environmental where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.”

Adequate policing is so fundamental to the concept of sustainable communities that I can see no reason, in principle, why it should be excluded for the purview of S106 financial contributions, subject to the relevant tests applicable to other public services. There is no reason, it seems to me why police equipment and other items of capital expenditure necessitated by additional development should not be funded, alongside, for example additional classrooms and stock and equipment for libraries”.

Without direct recognition to policing infrastructure Surrey Police consider policy ID1 of the emerging Local Plan would be inconsistent with paragraphs 17, 58, 69, 70, 156, 162, 177 and 186 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the recent judgement concerning policing between Jelson Limited vs Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Hinkley and Bosworth Borough Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Appendix 1 - Examples of Appeal Decisions Supporting Police Contributions.pdf (262 KB)
Appendix 2 - November 2016 High Court Decision.pdf (401 KB)
Appendix 4 - 17-07-13_DL_IR_Fontwell_Avenue_Arun_3143095 (002).pdf (1.0 MB)
Appendix 3 - Leicestershire Police vs Blaby DC.pdf (125 KB)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Station redevelopment etc.

The Council documents refer to development and platform works at Guildford station together with aspirations for new stations within the locality and improvements on both the Portsmouth Direct and North Downs Lines.

There are only two references to Guildford (which are already complete and not the specific schemes listed) in the Enhancements Delivery Plan (EDP) which describes the outputs, scope and milestones for projects and ring fenced funds that Network Rail is committed to deliver in the current control period CP5 (1st April 2014 to 31st March 2019). Network Rail publishes an updated version of the EDP every quarter. ORR holds Network Rail to account for the delivery of the outputs it has committed to the funders of enhancements; in England and Wales this is typically the Department for Transport (DfT).

ORR does not present plans for future railway enhancement projects such as these to Parliament (although some are joint Train Operating Companies and Network Rail funded). The current process involves ORR requesting that DfT produce a High Level Output Statement (HLOS) which states what it requires the railway to achieve as a part of the run up to the h

As a response to our recent consultation on the treatment of enhancements DfT has said that its forthcoming HLOS may not include new enhancements schemes this time, with these being dealt with in a separate process outside of PR18.

The national rail network controlled by Network Rail is divided into a number of routes, Guildford falls under Wessex.

The Wessex Route Study, which sets out the strategic vision for the future of this part of the rail network over the next 30 years and provides options for funders was established in August 2015 contained many of the points raised by the Council, which would have had an opportunity to comment on Network Rail’s plans.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Total records: 2273.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Policy ID2 - Supporting the Department for Transport's "Road Investment Strategy"
Policy I2: Supporting the Department for Transport's "Road Investment Strategy"

We welcome inclusion of this policy although we consider the proposals inadequate to address the backlog of investment and future needs. Guildford should be a very cost beneficial place to invest.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

4.6.18 We are troubled reference to an A3 tunnel beyond the Plan period has been deleted and that land is not safeguarded for entrances or works areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

kkkkk) We are concerned that Policy ID2 is not sufficiently robust as to require works to be carried out as part of such developments in the neighbourhood of the A3 and M25.

lllll) We note at 4.6.18 reference to A3 widening and/or a tunnel option have been deleted. There needs to be a statement of intent to work towards a long-term solution to the A3 past Guildford which, in the opinion of the Society, will require a new alignment or approach.
mmm) No major resolution is likely to be forthcoming during the plan period. It is entirely likely that adding the proposed new four-way junction at Send will increase traffic and rat-running until a permanent solution to the A3 is found. The proposed Ockham junction will have a similar effect.

nnn) A more significant characteristic of the A3 past Guildford is that it climbs almost 100 metres in around 3.5km from the point at which it crosses the River Wey to the cutting at the top of the Hog’s Back.

[Image]

ooo) The turning off towards Farnham at the apex of a long steep climb causes problems due to slow-moving, nose-to-tail traffic in the inside lane conflicting with traffic in the outside lane wishing to exit onto the A31.

ppp) Widening the A3 will not especially help solve the problems associated with the 1 in 35 climb that quickly lead to a build-up at the Dennis Roundabout junction where traffic joins from the town, and then backs up quickly beyond that to the A320 turn.

qqq) Showing an extended line to near the Compton roundabout demonstrates the impact of crossing over the North Downs in either direction.

[Image]

rrr) Whilst these graphics are very basic and approximate, they do show part of the challenge caused by the current configuration of the A3 that has been running at capacity for around 20 years at peak hours, the overspill traffic rat-running through the town and neighbouring villages and residential areas.

(Please refer to chats Page 25. On uploaded document)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp171/2040</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRANSPORT – TOPIC PAPER (2017)
In addition to points made elsewhere in our response, we are concerned that Guildford Borough Council seems to be putting far too much emphasis on the A3 improvements (and an aspirational tunnel) to solve all their problems. Traffic (and its knock-on effect on other forms of transport) will get a lot worse in the interim in the town centre, however much they attempt to delay development. The net effect will be strangle growth rather than encourage it.

DUTY TO COOPERATE – TOPIC PAPER (2017)
Guildford Borough Council has, by and large, made good efforts to cooperate with other Boroughs and agencies, and it takes two to cooperate in each case. We are disappointed at the number of references to third parties (such as Highways England) that have been removed from this draft plan because agreement has not been reached. We also believe the duty to cooperate should apply to cooperation with residents’ groups and community organisations such as the Guildford Society. There are too many loose ends that prevent the plan being satisfactorily completed, but we recognise that Guildford Borough Council wishes to press ahead towards adoption of its plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

We object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft Plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network.

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the OAN at a much earlier stage in the Plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I2 – Supporting Dept. of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

WHPC view: Neutral

In brief: The new development proposals throughout the Borough, if allowed, will overload roads and lanes. Surrey CC Highways will need to invest £ millions. Not just a Dept. of Transport issue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

The proposed widening of the M25 will only increase the amount of vehicles being drawn to junction 10 on the A3. The proposed building developments will only worsen the current situation.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3166  Respondent: 8568193 / Miss Edwina Attwood  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11.1 OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I worry that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situation worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2201  Respondent: 8570273 / Fiona Curtis  Agent: Fiona Curtis

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy i2

Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy” This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council has suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but there is no evidence to show that this is a realistic option. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN to constrain the housing target.

Public bus services have been cut and housing is proposed outside the town with a hugely expensive sustainable corridor so that people can walk or cycle in. Why not save money and build the houses in the town where people want them? This policy is in some ways ageist as elderly and infirm and those with small children are unlikely to benefit from this proposal as Guildford is very hilly!
Much of the funding is from development which will limit if not negate the implementation of affordable housing, which was originally a key driver of the Plan?

The 3 schemes are insufficient to prevent severe congestion on our highways and this is using a traffic model that has probably underestimated the issue. Constraints must be applied to the development levels or development needs to be put where infrastructure already exists and improvements can be considered rather than new infrastructure?

If the tunnel is a genuine consideration then land needs to be safe guarded or the notion should be removed. the same applies to railway stations which have been mentioned to pave the way for sustainable development but Network Rail has not agreed to them, even in principle (lacking the duty to cooperate).

The infrastructure proposals lack sufficient detail.'Improvements’ to x junction is inadequate. Details should outline exactly where and what the proposal is and what improvements will transpire?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13056  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object for the following reasons.

90. This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limits the scope for future improvements.

91. However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if Highways England decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic.

92. The result of the EU referendum must raise uncertainties about existing budget provision and priorities for Highways England projects.

93. The road improvements are likely to lead to significant disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to such a large housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the housing number for this Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/1707  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The removal of item 4.6.17 is puzzling. In the rationale for changes it is described as a potential statement of common
ground with Highways England. GBC believe that it is likely to be agreed nearer to the plan Examination – but once
again it highlights the lack of control over key roads infrastructure in formulating the Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5961  **Respondent:** 8575585 / Ian Macpherson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

Policy 12: Supporting the Department for Transport's "Road Investment Strategy"

While the M25 proposals are of some interest, the A3 proposals are in principle of central importance to Guildford, as
they will unlock much. But what are they? We are told in the vaguest terms, but either proffered alternative will affect
much on the ground. To not have some detail does undermine the transport section of the draft Local Plan.

Note that one particular issue that arises is Compton. This is a pretty valuable Conservation Area, but the road through
has become what is in effect a 'South Guildford By-pass' -a situation that will get worse with A3 improvements. How is
this to be tackled -for tackled it must be!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7033  **Respondent:** 8575617 / Effingham Parish Council (Ian Symes)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I2 – No comment

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/18726  **Respondent:** 8581089 / Jenny Wicks  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

Policy I2
I object to this policy since it is too vague and optimistic. Action by Highways England on improving the strategic road network is a long way off and, apart from schemes already identified for funding, is unlikely to happen. The building of a tunnel is so unlikely it hardly merits mention.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17569  **Respondent:** 8581505 / Burpham Neighbourhood Forum (Jim Allen)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Supporting Highways England’s Road policy is actually a legal responsibility.

It should be noted their [Highways England] time scale for meeting infrastructure requirements does not start until 2020. Any development alongside the A3 cannot (due to lack of infrastructure) start until or after that time.

Thus this Plan is undeliverable within the time schedules laid out.

It should also be noted that road intersections deemed as a requirement at the numerically lower traffic levels of the late 1970’s / early 1980’s have not been included within the plan. Those deemed as a requirement were:

- A320 south bound on and off the A3. [Ref. Documents Surrey History Centre for completion of the Burpham Ladymead bypass 1978-1982]
- Four way inter section A3 with Gosden Hill [see document Gosden Hill plan 1982.]
- Link Road from the bullet point immediately above to the A25. [see document Gosden Hill plan 1982.]

**Target for Policy I2**

Note: There is currently a £1.5 billion Surrey Infrastructure budget deficit prior to these proposals.

The Target actually reads:- ‘the three schemes on the strategic road network (locations not identified) within Guildford Borough as identified in the 2015-2020 period to be implemented by 2033!!!’

That means 28,000 vehicles, with 30% increased pollution level, will be on the roads of Guildford before the roads needed to serve the new homes are even planned to be built.

THIS IS UNSUSTAINABLE UNSOUND and UNTENABLE.

Note: Pollution level taken from the EA Spread sheet giving base level pollution calculations for given local traffic levels, speed and composition of vehicles

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12174  **Respondent:** 8582017 / The Clandon Society (J Wright)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Target actually reads:- ‘the three schemes on the strategic road network (locations not identified) within Guildford Borough as identified in the 2015-2020 period to be implemented by 2033!!!’

That means 28,000 vehicles, with 30% increased pollution level, will be on the roads of Guildford before the roads needed to serve the new homes are even planned to be built.

THIS IS UNSUSTAINABLE UNSOUND and UNTENABLE.

Note: Pollution level taken from the EA Spread sheet giving base level pollution calculations for given local traffic levels, speed and composition of vehicles

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy 12: Supporting the Department for Transports “Road Investment Strategy”

4.6.18: It is written in this paragraph: “…the scheme could either be the widening of the existing A3 carriageways or a tunnel option”. For the tunnel to be possible land needs reserving for a tunnel entrance.

Land should also be reserved for a bridge over the river and railway to unite the two sides of Guildford and take the pressure of the gyratory system.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2463  Respondent: 8585601 / Jennie Kyte  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY 2DI: Infrastructure and delivery

4.6.18 I object to the A3 tunnel option being deleted. The A3 cuts Guildford into two halves despoiling its attractiveness as a scenic heritage town, and causing noise pollution from very heavy traffic which impacts upon swathes of residential areas, lowering the quality of life for many residents. The Government says it wants to spend on infrastructure; Guildford should begin to lobby for a tunnel with a widened A3 for future generations. Tunnels are a way of life for other European countries, even though they are less crowded and have more space. Even junctions are built underground.

Land should be safeguarded to allow for tunnel entrances.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6448  Respondent: 8586369 / Mr Luigi Fort  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel...
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15879  Respondent: 8586369 / Mr Luigi Fort  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2027  Respondent: 8593185 / Niels Laub  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )

I OBJECT

This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.

However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements are not planned to be implemented until 2026 and would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan. These road improvements are likely to lead to massive disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to allow any development on strategic sites dependant on access to the A3 until completion of the A3 improvements. The only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11215  Respondent: 8602337 / Cross Group (Mr Colin Cross)  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8651</th>
<th>Respondent: 8608225 / Valerie Jenner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy I2</strong> - Supporting the Dept of Transport's Road Investment Strategy</td>
<td>I object to this policy only relating to the strategic road network, the A3/M25, without ensuring any development includes the necessary local road infrastructure being implemented. I object to developers funding road infrastructure which suits their wishes, i.e. south bound slip road and north bound slip roads at the Burnt Common roundabout. Such provision at Burnt Common will not alleviate increased traffic on the local roads and villages should the 2,000+ houses be built at the former Wisley Airfield, as local villages already suffers traffic log-jams on a daily basis without such a development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1046</th>
<th>Respondent: 8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of planned road infrastructure. (PolicyI1). I live on the Portsmouth Road which runs through Ripley and Send adjacent to Garlick's Arch. We are already coping with large amounts of traffic which is often diverted onto our road when an accident closes the A3. The A3 from the junction north of the village to the M25 is almost at a standstill during the rush hour both going north in the morning and coming south in the evening. All of the above developments are sited along the A3 and with the number of houses proposed probably in the region of an extra 5000 cars will be wishing to use our local roads. Congestion will be even worse and at present Highways England has no plans to start considering improving the A3 before 2020. There should therefore be no development until this has been considered (Policy I2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2 | Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) | |
| WBDRA is in SUPPORT of this policy and would COMMENT that improvements to the A3 road are needed immediately before any more housing development takes place. | Guildford already has been rechristened by WBDRA as Gridlock | |
| Infrastructure improvements MUST come before any more housing development | **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** | Attached documents: |
POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

We object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/466  Respondent: 8640353 / Julian Cranwell  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I2: Supporting the Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

Response

Summary

I OBJECT to this policy as it stands. This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.

However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to significant disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to such a large housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

Detailed response:

Funding for prospective road improvements has not been secured.

The wording of this policy is far too vague. Terms such as “working with” Highways England, to “facilitate” improvements, “to take account” of “emerging proposals” mean that this policy is, in effect, meaningless. Typographical errors – such as the misspelling of “licensed” – must also be corrected.

The Road Investment Strategy phase 2 (RIS2) for the period post 2020 is currently in the research stage. Until the research is completed it is impossible to prejudge what impact this will have on the Strategic Road network. However, the Strategic Transport Assessment does state “4.8.6 It should be noted that despite these improvements, Figure 4.7 shows the A3 is still operating overcapacity with resulting impacts on congestion.” and “4.5.10 Currently it is unclear why some minor roads in or just outside Guildford town centre are showing increases. These include roads such as Nightingale Road, Denmark Road and Tormead Road. However, it could be related to re-routing occurring as a result of the improvements to the A3 through Guildford attracting drivers to both join the A3 and remain on the A3 at Guildford and weaving through local streets.” Also, at 4.8.3 “At the same time, average vehicle speeds increase not just on the A3 but across the network within the borough as a whole. However, despite this it should be noted that although the average speed across the network in Scenario 5 is higher than in Scenario 1 (the Do-Minimum), there are differences
within the network with average speeds on A roads and minor roads lower than in Scenario 1.” In other words, traffic congestion on the local road network is predicted to be worse under this draft Local Plan.

It is possible or indeed probable that no further funding will be available, or that any funding will not meet projected full costs. If this funding is unavailable in full, then this policy should clearly state that projects cannot be developed.

RECOMMENDATION:

I propose that unless guaranteed public funds are available to cover costs in full, there should be no development of any individual sites of more than 10 homes outside the urban areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10096  Respondent: 8640353 / Julian Cranwell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We OBJECT to this policy as it stands. This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.

However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to significant disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to such a large housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

Funding for prospective road improvements has not been secured.

The wording of this policy is far too vague. Terms such as “working with” Highways England, to “facilitate” improvements, “to take account” of “emerging proposals” mean that this policy is, in effect, meaningless. Typographical errors – such as the misspelling of “licensed” – must also be corrected.

The Road Investment Strategy phase 2 (RIS2) for the period post 2020 is currently in the research stage. Until the research is completed it is impossible to prejudge what impact this will have on the Strategic Road network. However, the Strategic Transport Assessment does state “4.8.6 It should be noted that despite these improvements, Figure 4.7 shows the A3 is still operating overcapacity with resulting impacts on congestion.” and “4.5.10 Currently it is unclear why some minor roads in or just outside Guildford town centre are showing increases. These include roads such as Nightingale Road, Denman Road and Tormead Road. However, it could be related to re-routing occurring as a result of the improvements to the A3 through Guildford attracting drivers to both join the A3 and remain on the A3 at Guildford and weaving through local streets.” Also, at 4.8.3 “At the same time, average vehicle speeds increase not just on the A3 but across the network within the borough as a whole. However, despite this it should be noted that although the average speed across the network in Scenario 5 is higher than in Scenario 1 (the Do-Minimum), there are differences within the network with average speeds on A roads and minor roads lower than in Scenario 1.” In other words, traffic congestion on the local road network is predicted to be worse under this draft Local Plan.
It is possible or indeed probable that no further funding will be available, or that any funding will not meet projected full costs. If this funding is unavailable in full, then this policy should clearly state that projects cannot be developed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

We propose that unless guaranteed public funds are available to cover costs in full, there should be no development of any individual sites of more than 10 homes outside the urban areas.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5242  **Respondent:** 8655233 / Kay Mackay  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY I2**

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5047  **Respondent:** 8667713 / Victoria Sinnett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY I2**

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2) I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years
away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1088  Respondent: 8687265 / Dagero Ltd (David Roberts)  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

I OBJECT. This policy is too vague and optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2640  Respondent: 8693153 / Vicki Willetts  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY): • Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough. • Out of sync with DTP’s strategy: houses to be
built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented. • Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit. Probably won’t happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/15027</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8708545 / Nigel Wicks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object because of the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), would take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/4503</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8709249 / Geoff Spink</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. POLICY I2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY):

- Policy doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough.
- Plan is out of sync with DTP’s strategy: houses would be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc are implemented.
- Many of the road plans are too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit, and very likely will never happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years away especially with EU uncertainties. Nothing should be considered before these are completed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. **POLICY I2**

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3503</th>
<th>Respondent: 8726529 / Eric Palmer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16906</th>
<th>Respondent: 8728865 / Neville Bryan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Object

Needs to be integrated with Policy I1 and isn’t.
The A3 tunnel is not funded.

Infrastructure funding and support is needed before housing and employment growth are factored in.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15811  Respondent: 8732993 / Michael Weber  Agent:  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12948  Respondent: 8735873 / David and Gillian Allan  Agent:  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
I object to the policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5115  Respondent: 8741377 / Lisanne Mealing  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13875  Respondent: 8743137 / Ben Woodford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate post Brexit, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.
1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12311  Respondent: 8749473 / Charlotte Beckett  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8587  Respondent: 8751105 / Amanda Harris  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12539  Respondent: 8769793 / Laura Richards  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I OBJECT to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5073  Respondent: 8770177 / Phil Attwood  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I worry that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situation worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4893  Respondent: 8771233 / Ranald Mackinnon  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5588  Respondent: 8771265 / H C MacKinnon  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2).

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT. This policy is too vague and optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolishly. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5277  Respondent: 8810113 / Louise Stewart  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 and M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16534  Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2768  Respondent: 8813601 / Gaenor Richards  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6138  Respondent: 8817953 / Sheena Ewen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity and even standstill during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will exacerbate the situation further.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16444  Respondent: 8818625 / Beth and Frank Fuller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11102</th>
<th>Respondent: 8828545 / Anjali Mittal</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 12 - Supporting the DOT's 'Road Investment Strategy'.</strong></td>
<td>OBJECT. Obviously we must support the DOT but to put faith in an A3 tunnel gives a new dimension to the term 'wishful thinking'. There is simply no indication of how the traffic infrastructure could be modified to support the new proposals. Nor is there any mention of the Surrey County Council's £800,000,000 infrastructure deficit. Any future building of a tunnel would be decades away, witness the concept to delivery of the Hindhead tunnel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/115781</th>
<th>Respondent: 8836129 / Roger Shapley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)</td>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan. There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the larger residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse. <strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15781</th>
<th>Respondent: 8836129 / Roger Shapley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period.

Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic.

Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. The road improvements are likely to lead to massive disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to a massive housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7098  Respondent: 8837313 / Maria Baker  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16231  Respondent: 8839041 / Jon Maslin  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’

This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but there is no evidence to show that this is a realistic option. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.
The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN to constrain the housing target.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13417  Respondent: 8840033 / Jimmy Daboo  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan. This is clearly a huge flaw in the plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13189  Respondent: 8840449 / David Wilson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I2: Supporting the Department for Transport's “Road Investment Strategy”

14.1. The policy needs to ensure that pollution levels are reduced in the A3 M25 areas relating to Surrey.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPP16/18193  Respondent: 8843361 / Adrian Atkinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy” This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometer, compared with an English average of 413. This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10605  Respondent: 8855969 / Jonathan Murphy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2529  Respondent: 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

this is very misleading as funding for traffic infrastructure is not available to complete the limited ambition highlighted in the plan.
The proposals for widening the A3 are not economically sound the gains are not justifiable so funding cannot be guaranteed yet projects and sites will have been given the green light and despite stating no infrastructure no development these appear to be just words with no teeth.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17792  Respondent: 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to this policy as it stands. This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.

However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to significant disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to such a large housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

Funding for prospective road improvements has not been secured.

The wording of this policy is far too vague. Terms such as “working with” Highways England, to “facilitate” improvements, “to take account” of “emerging proposals” mean that this policy is, in effect, meaningless. Typographical errors – such as the misspelling of “licensed” – must also be corrected.

The Road Investment Strategy phase 2 (RIS2) for the period post 2020 is currently in the research stage. Until the research is completed it is impossible to prejudge what impact this will have on the Strategic Road network. However, the Strategic Transport Assessment does state “4.8.6 It should be noted that despite these improvements, Figure 4.7 shows the A3 is still operating overcapacity with resulting impacts on congestion.” and “4.5.10 Currently it is unclear why some minor roads in or just outside Guildford town centre are showing increases. These include roads such as Nightingale Road, Denmark Road and Tormead Road. However, it could be related to re-routing occurring as a result of the improvements to the A3 through Guildford attracting drivers to both join the A3 and remain on the A3 at Guildford and weaving through local streets.” Also, at 4.8.3 “At the same time, average vehicle speeds increase not just on the A3 but across the network within the borough as a whole. However, despite this it should be noted that although the average speed across the network in Scenario 5 is higher than in Scenario 1 (the Do-Minimum), there are differences within the network with average speeds on A roads and minor roads lower than in Scenario 1.” In other words, traffic congestion on the local road network is predicted to be worse under this draft Local Plan.

It is possible or indeed probable that no further funding will be available, or that any funding will not meet projected full costs. If this funding is unavailable in full, then this policy should clearly state that projects cannot be developed.

RECOMMENDATION:

I propose that unless guaranteed public funds are available to cover costs in full, there should be no development of any individual sites of more than 10 homes outside the urban areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Policy 12 - Supporting the Department of Transport's Road Investment Strategy

I object. The policy is too optimistic and the decisions are a long way off. They are expensive and may not be built. The draft plan commits to building housing estates in the countryside before these improvements are in place. The policy will create massive congestion and disruption.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to this policy as it fails to address the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads- the A3/M25 (Policy I2). The draft plan commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network. Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that the A3 or M25 will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans even to examine improving the A3 before 2020. I am therefore extremely concerned that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will make the situation far worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to this policy as it stands. This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work
closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.

However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to significant disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to such a large housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

Funding for prospective road improvements has not been secured.

The wording of this policy is far too vague. Terms such as “working with” Highways England, to “facilitate” improvements, “to take account” of “emerging proposals” mean that this policy is, in effect, meaningless. Typographical errors – such as the misspelling of “licensed” – must also be corrected.

The Road Investment Strategy phase 2 (RIS2) for the period post 2020 is currently in the research stage. Until the research is completed it is impossible to prejudge what impact this will have on the Strategic Road network. However, the Strategic Transport Assessment does state “4.8.6 It should be noted that despite these improvements, Figure 4.7 shows the A3 is still operating overcapacity with resulting impacts on congestion,” and “4.5.10 Currently it is unclear why some minor roads in or just outside Guildford town centre are showing increases. These include roads such as Nightingale Road, Denmark Road and Tormead Road. However, it could be related to re-routing occurring as a result of the improvements to the A3 through Guildford attracting drivers to both join the A3 and remain on the A3 at Guildford and weaving through local streets.” Also, at 4.8.3 “At the same time, average vehicle speeds increase not just on the A3 but across the network within the borough as a whole. However, despite this it should be noted that although the average speed across the network in Scenario 5 is higher than in Scenario 1 (the Do-Minimum), there are differences within the network with average speeds on A roads and minor roads lower than in Scenario 1.” In other words, traffic congestion on the local road network is predicted to be worse under this draft Local Plan.

It is possible or indeed probable that no further funding will be available, or that any funding will not meet projected full costs. If this funding is unavailable in full, then this policy should clearly state that projects cannot be developed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

I propose that unless guaranteed public funds are available to cover costs in full, there should be no development of any individual sites of more than 10 homes outside the urban areas.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1131</th>
<th>Respondent: 8860897 / Julia Shaw</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> (Yes), <strong>is Sound?</strong> (No), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> (Yes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The removal of item 4.6.17 is puzzling. In the rationale for changes it is described as a potential statement of common ground with Highways England. It is not clear whether GBC are uncertain whether it will happen at all or just the timing – but once again it highlights the lack of control over key roads infrastructure in formulating the Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11374</th>
<th>Respondent: 8865537 / P Waldner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14849</th>
<th>Respondent: 8865985 / Grant Ringshaw</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1356</th>
<th>Respondent: 8875233 / Richard Hiam</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7162</th>
<th>Respondent: 8881345 / Lynne Ground</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11586</th>
<th>Respondent: 8881537 / Jean Baptist</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan. There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3331</th>
<th>Respondent: 8883489 / N &amp; B Hinchliff</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate post Brexit, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5754   Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French   Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16624   Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French   Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4592   Respondent: 8892673 / Nick Forwood   Agent:
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2).

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Reviewing Highways England material, suggests that it has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to this as the Network Highways England makes decisions on the A3 and M25, and proposals for the A3 improvements would be delivered at the end of the plan period. If this plan is implemented a massive road building growth would be needed and result in even more gridlocked traffic around Guildford, road improvements will lead to further disruptions. Traffic constraints should be reflected in reduction of large housing numbers. Public funds should be available to cover costs of improvements in full, or housing developments should be limited to ten houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16984  Respondent: 8893057 / Dianne Garnett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1 We object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

1.2 This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete. 1.3 The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12615  Respondent: 8894657 / Jacob's Well Residents' Association (Janet Smith)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the improvements planned for the A3 through Guildford which are long overdue.

I object to the CLLR which is not a sustainable way for traffic to reach the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1546  Respondent: 8894657 / Jacob's Well Residents' Association (Janet Smith)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2
We support the improvements planned for the A3 through Guildford (which are long overdue) and to empower the Gosden Hill and Wisley developments.

We object to any future Clay Lane Link Road, which is not a sustainable way for traffic to reach the A3, as it would cross a 3b floodplain, create very dangerous junctions, disrupt a fragile ecosystem and cause unacceptable air and noise pollution close to residential properties, with many elderly residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12147  Respondent: 8896097 / Andrew Fordham  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period.

Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14760  Respondent: 8896161 / Carol Wilson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I2: Supporting the Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”
The policy needs to ensure that pollution levels are reduced in the A3 M25 areas relating to Surrey.

Building of new and improved roads will take years and needs to be properly planned and started before any large housing developments start.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

TRAFFIC CHAOS

We object to the planned development because it will cause traffic chaos and gridlock. When GBC's elected councillors voted through the Draft Plan (on 24.5.16) they failed to scrutinise the Strategic Transport Report - a major piece of evidence. (Adjournment was requested so that this vital piece of evidence could be considered but GBC's councillors failed to allow this).

Surrey County Council's traffic simulations verify that the level of traffic on our roads is already above the capacity that they were designed for. GBC's unrealistic growth plans for Normandy and Flexford will force more traffic onto the already congested A3, A323, Cl6 and D60. There is no evidence of secure funding for any improvements to the A3 during the lifetime of the Draft Plan.

The already highly congested road network in and around Normandy/Flexford will grind to a halt at peak times causing significant adverse impact to the daily lives of local residents and small businesses. One major existing traffic congestion issue is the railway arch in Westwood Lane which only allows alternate single lane through traffic. It is already hazardous and a bottleneck for traffic at peak times. There is no capacity to change this in the future. The increased traffic will also cause a massive increase in exhaust pollution with excessive levels of nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide - threatening the health of all residents.

Traffic Black Spots Near Site Access - North end of Parcel of land A46 (Guildford Rd Junction with Westwood Lane).

Access to any development of houses and I or flats at rear of The Old Vicarage, Wyke would cause increased traffic dangers to an already very dangerous junction at comer of Westwood Lane and Guildford Road where there have been several fatalities.

There is also already heavy traffic at the Wyke Primary School across the road from the same junction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6720  Respondent: 8896673 / James Gooden  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13616  Respondent: 8899617 / Claire Nix  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. The proposed development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8038  **Respondent:** 8899713 / Tessa Crago  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4256  **Respondent:** 8900705 / Susan Fuller  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s
Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4117  Respondent: 8901633 / Duncan Gray  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8168  Respondent: 8902465 / Linda Slater  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY):

• Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough.
• Out of sync with DTP’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented.
• Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit. Probably won’t happen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18527</th>
<th>Respondent: 8903265 / Susan Anderson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14998  Respondent: 8906273 / G Baptist  Agent: 

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9644  Respondent: 8906305 / Anne Fort  Agent: 

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I
have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situation worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18430  Respondent: 8909761 / Diana Grover  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate post Brexit, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11730  Respondent: 8910145 / Mr G.W. & Mrs A.C. Spratt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate post Brexit, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to Policy 12. This document was not available before The Plan went to consultation, by a majority vote at full council. The transport strategy only deals with 'strategic roads' M25 and A3. There is no funding available for any improvements to either. The Plan envisages an A3 tunnel which is exceptionally expensive and will never be built during the life of this Plan or most likely the next. This means major strategic sites will go ahead approx 6,000 new homes needing to access to the strategic roads, but will be unable to, so the traffic will affect all the surrounding villages. The A323 which will also have increased commuter traffic due to the 4,000 planned homes in Aldershot, 4 miles away will impact on our road network, already working above their intended capacity. It will be a disaster. The Brexit vote has not been taken into consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17841</th>
<th>Respondent: 8920129 / Allan Siva</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICIES I1, I2 & I3**

The principal thoroughfares traversing East Horsley are narrow and winding, have a series of pinch points, have sections without any pavements and are generally unlit. In reality “East Horsley has lanes, not roads.” East Horsley’s ‘lanes’ are totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them. It is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley Airfield site, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

I therefore **OBJECT** to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11988</th>
<th>Respondent: 8921377 / Paul Maycox</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I **OBJECT** due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13015</th>
<th>Respondent: 8921569 / Steven Cliff</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highways England will not even look at improving the A3 before 2020. I have real concerns that development of large residential sites at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will happen before the trunk road network is improved. Queues are already horrendous at rush hour on the A3 & M25 in our area. Development in and around Ripley will make this worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13229  **Respondent:** 8921857 / Claire Kukielka  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5790  **Respondent:** 8924577 / Charles Lee  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3
& M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15159  Respondent:  8926529 / Annie Cross  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I2 - Supporting the Dept of Transport's Road Investment Strategy

I object to this policy only relating to the strategic road network, the A3/M25, without ensuring any development includes the necessary road infrastructure being implemented. I object to developers funding road infrastructure which suits their wishes, i.e. south bound slip road and north bound slip roads at the Ockham roundabout. Such provision at Burnt Common will not alleviate increased traffic on the local roads and villages should the 2,000+ houses be built at the former Wisley Airfield. The village already suffers traffic log-jams on a daily basis without such a development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11713  Respondent:  8928033 / P. Richardson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11939  Respondent:  8928289 / Trevor Skerritt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4459  Respondent: 8930209 / Ray Corstin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8788  Respondent: 8933185 / Peter See  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4.6.14, Policy I2: Supporting the Department for Transport's "Road Investment Strategy"

A320: A320 Woking Road
4.6.15
has and: has worked and

4.6.17
Note: delete brackets

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/48  Respondent: 8933185 / Peter See  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4.6.14, Policy ID2: Supporting the Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”
A320: A320 Woking Road

This is suggested to help clarity, as the location of this road may not be well known compared with eg the A3 or A31

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

[This comment has been removed because it did not relate to a change to the plan.]

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17124  Respondent: 8940225 / Glen Ruddy  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16059  Respondent: 8941761 / FLGCA (Paul Kassell)  Agent:
Policy I2: Supporting the Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

9.2 As discussed in more detail below in our response to Policy A25 (Gosden Hill), GBC should be taking a far more positive and proactive approach in securing the delivery of the improvements identified in the Department for Transport’s Road Investment Strategy (RIS). We are concerned that the statement at the end of the Vision (page 21 of the Local Plan) suggests that the delivery of housing is dependent on these measures. It is therefore imperative that the RIS A3 improvement schemes are implemented as soon as practicably possible to ensure the Local Plan is deliverable.

9.3 We also note that reference in made in paragraph 4.6.18 to a feasibility study currently being undertaken which could establish that the scheme for the A3 through Guildford could be either widening of the existing A3 carriageways or a tunnel option. In summary, MGH does not consider a tunnel option to be realistic and we understand is unlikely to be pursued by Highways England / Department for Transport. It should therefore be discounted at this early feasibility stage.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9385</th>
<th>Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT. The wording of this policy &quot;will need to take account of&quot; is too vague.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It only considers the A3 and M25 and ignores the impact the local plan will have on other roads in the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore the draft plan commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of the road improvements described are in place, leading to widespread congestion and delays to journeys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This policy is based on a flawed Strategic Highway Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17312</th>
<th>Respondent: 8967233 / University of Surrey (University of Surrey)</th>
<th>Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Luke Vallins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University agrees that there should be improvements to the A3 and M25 to enhance access into Guildford and reduce congestion levels. It is therefore encouraging that improvements are included within the Department for Transport’s Road Investment Strategy, as outlined in Policy I2 and the University would welcome improvements provided they are effective and are delivered in a timely manner.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, the University is concerned with the view that the delivery of housing in the later stages of the plan period is dependent upon major improvement to the A3 through Guildford, and considers that this has not yet been robustly demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strategic Highway Assessment (SHA) Report (SCC, June 2016) comes to this conclusion, but recognises that its approach represents a “worst case” in terms of highway demand that has not taken into account any reduction in trips generated because of the mixed use nature of large developments or proposed investment in sustainable transport modes and other mitigation measures. Detailed comments in relation to the SHA are provided separately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Local Plan should reflect the fact that highway infrastructure requirements set out are based on a ‘worst case’ assessment of highway impacts and that there must be flexibility in delivery. This should be reflected in the Local Plan Vision and in Policy I1 and Appendix C.

Nevertheless, the University recognises that further, more detailed assessment work will be required ahead of examination, such as identifying at what point widening of the A3 is triggered and what development can come forward ahead of this. In this regard, it will endeavour to provide technical assistance to GBC, SCC and Highways England wherever possible.

The University is aware of the proposed improvements to the A3 and M25 and has factored these into its future development proposals given the proximity of the University and Blackwell Farm (Policy A26) to the A3.

However, the University would be concerned if the need for these improvements and the programme for their delivery placed onerous constraints on its own development on its campus, or that of the Blackwell Farm site.

The plan should acknowledge that there are circumstances in which sustainable development of some elements of important strategic sites may come forward in advance of projects in the RIS.

In particular at Blackwell Farm (Policy A26) there is potential for development to come forward that can take some pressure off the A3 by providing an access into and out of the Surrey Research Park, the Royal Surrey County Hospital and the University via the new access on the A31. The residential development at this location is also on the Sustainable Movement Corridor with good links to the town centre by public transport, walking and cycling.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13118  Respondent: 8993121 / Shelagh Yeomans  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I2: Supporting the Department for Transport's “Road Investment Strategy”

I OBJECT to this policy.

- This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.

- However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to significant disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to such a large housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11474  Respondent: 9062913 / Susan Parker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

OBJECT This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.
However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to massive disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to a massive housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/1872  Respondent: 9062913 / Susan Parker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The removal of item 4.6.17 is puzzling. In the rationale for changes it is described as a potential statement of common ground with Highways England. It is not clear whether GBC believe that it is likely to be agreed nearer to the plan Examination – but once again it highlights the lack of control over key roads infrastructure in formulating the Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18565  Respondent: 9079393 / Wisley Property Investments Ltd.  Agent: Savills (Charles Collins)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I2: Supporting the DfT’s RIS

Support (Sound)

WPI supports the draft policy and initiatives to enable Highways England deliver the Roads Investment Strategy 2 (RIS 2). The Local Plan delivery should be phased alongside the RIS 2. In respect of specific development proposals, whilst regard for RIS 2 is essential, due regard to infrastructure phasing proposals, in accordance with draft policy I1, is important (see WPI’s suggested amendments). It may be the case that development can proceed on the basis of short term or interim measures, ahead of Government investment decisions.

Transport technical evidence in support of the Wisley new settlement is included at Appendix 3.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents: 160715_Local_Plan_Reps__July_2016__and_Appendices.pdf (11.0 MB)

Comment ID: pslp171/2760  Respondent: 9079393 / Wisley Property Investments Ltd.  Agent: Savills (Jim Beavan)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Section/page/para</th>
<th>Original Changes requested (July 2016 Representation)</th>
<th>Understanding of changes shown in the Focused Amendments (June 2017)</th>
<th>WPI Comments (Updated Representation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy I2: Supporting the DfT’s RIS Page 111</td>
<td>WPI supports the draft policy.</td>
<td>(Page 126). The Title of the policy has changed to “ID2”. The requirement relating to RIS has also been amended to state that “promoters of sites close to the A3 and M25 and strategic sites will need to take account of any emerging proposals by Highways England…”</td>
<td>WPI welcomes the clarification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. POLICY I2

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT. This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England (“HE”). It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with HE to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements. However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to massive disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to a massive housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10658</th>
<th>Respondent: 9335041 / David Reeve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>()</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy I2: Supporting The Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

This policy again sounds hopeful on a first reading, however the same point applies as was identified for Policy I1. Paragraph 4.6.14 identifies three RIS Schemes that are relevant to Guildford:

- M25 upgrade J10 and J16 (“anticipated to commence” 2015 – 2020)
- M25/A3 interchange improvement (“anticipated to commence” 2020 – 2025)
- A3 improvements from the A320 to the A31 (no timescale given)

Similarly, paragraph 4.6.15 states that “The Council has and will continue to work closely with Highways England to tailor its development management processes, including for allocated strategic sites, with Highways England’s emerging schemes and their proposed timing and phasing. This will ensure that the assumptions used in developer’s transport assessments are robust. The timing and phasing of the delivery of Highways England’s emerging schemes will be key to addressing the existing peak hour congestion that often occurs on the Strategic Highway Network.”

Clearly the Council cannot be criticised for projects that are outside its control. However, it is not sensible or acceptable to propose a Local Plan that includes major developments in the borough that depend on key infrastructure delivered by an external supplier (Highways England) whose timescales are so questionable. I therefore OBJECT to this policy and to all policies that depend on it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6360</th>
<th>Respondent: 9607905 / Anne Pascoe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>()</td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10539  Respondent: 10299041 / F McHugh  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14859  Respondent: 10305921 / Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnersh (Kathy Slack)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Similarly we welcome Policy I2: Supporting the Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”. We note in particular that it is considered that the delivery of some housing targets is dependent upon major improvement to the A3
through Guildford. Enterprise M3 LEP will continue to work closely with partners and continue to put pressure on Government to deliver the infrastructure that is needed to unlock and support the development of key housing sites and would expect Guildford Borough to play an active role in this engagement with government. Enterprise M3 welcomes the strong emphasis throughout the plan on the benefits of investment in sustainable transport and the recognition that such investment can contribute significantly to economic growth. We are therefore supportive of Policy I3 related to sustainable transport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/3245  Respondent: 10305921 / Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnersh (Kathy Slack)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Similarly we welcome Policy I2: Supporting the Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”. We note in particular that it is considered that the delivery of some housing targets is dependent upon major improvement to the A3 through Guildford. Enterprise M3 LEP will continue to work closely with partners and continue to put pressure on Government to deliver the infrastructure that is needed to unlock and support the development of key housing sites and would expect Guildford Borough to play an active role in this engagement with government.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2299  Respondent: 10423265 / Jillian Tallick  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9751  Respondent: 10616289 / Hilary Percy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I do not believe that it is possible to improve the existing infrastructure (particularly roads) to cope with the influx of so many additional households.

I urge Guildford Borough Council to reconsider all its proposals within its draft plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12674  Respondent: 10619169 / Wendy Critchlow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8238  Respondent: 10662849 / Garry Walton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

I OBJECT. This policy is too vague and optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public...
spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square Km, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6026  Respondent: 10663585 / Nigel Killick  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to any increase in traffic to the surrounding areas, adding more slip roads to the A3 will only make traffic worse and increase congestion.

The main road through West Clandon is already congested with many speeding motorists and large commercial vehicles using it. Pollution will also be increased.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4547  Respondent: 10667073 / Trudi Harris  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads,A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5927  Respondent: 10672417 / Matthew Kalupka  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at over capacity levels during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17914</th>
<th>Respondent: 10722049 / Richard Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **I OBJECT** to the congestion that the proposed developments will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce the existing congestion during the Plan period. Currently, Highways England has no plans to improve the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that the development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at over capacity levels during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situation even worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11724</th>
<th>Respondent: 10723553 / Judith Pound</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12). Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14788</th>
<th>Respondent: 10735777 / S. May</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan. This is clearly a huge flaw in the plan.
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12599  Respondent: 10769121 / Ali Elson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13603  Respondent: 10773441 / Barry Marshall  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic...
disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11551  Respondent: 10774145 / P Jordan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1788  Respondent: 10776225 / Roger Main  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I2 – Supporting the Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”
I OBJECT. Road investment plans have a habit of being delayed or cancelled, particularly when projected costs begin to spiral. The two proposals in Road Period 1 (widening of the M25 and improvements to the M25/A3 junction) will probably increase traffic on the A3 and make matters worse around Guildford. The proposal in Road Period 2 for a tunnel under Guildford will never be more than a pipe-dream.

Nevertheless, the Local Plan proposes to build the new housing before these road improvements have been carried out. The lack of completed infrastructure must put severe constraints on what could actually be built, but the Local Plan fails to address this point.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10206  Respondent: 10780929 / Naren Nanda  Agent: 0

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13715  Respondent: 10782625 / Heather Alexander  Agent: 0

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY):

• Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough.
• Out of sync with DTp’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented.
• Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit. Probably won’t happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15319  Respondent: 10782689 / Murray Dudgeon  Agent: 0
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2).

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15041</th>
<th>Respondent: 10796417 / Richard Shenton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/851</th>
<th>Respondent: 10798049 / Steve &amp; Maureen Knight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support – GBC must support A3 changes and work with Highways England prior to considering any major road changes/developments (such as the non-justifiable CLLR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/346</th>
<th>Respondent: 10799169 / Neal Basson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY I2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to massive disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to a massive housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18392  Respondent: 10799169 / Neal Basson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.

However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to significant disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to a massive housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17543  Respondent: 10799425 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Susan Parker)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We OBJECT to this policy as it stands. This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.

However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to significant disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to such a large housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.
Funding for prospective road improvements has not been secured.

The wording of this policy is far too vague. Terms such as “working with” Highways England, to “facilitate” improvements, “to take account” of “emerging proposals” mean that this policy is, in effect, meaningless. Typographical errors – such as the misspelling of “licensed” – must also be corrected.

The Road Investment Strategy phase 2 (RIS2) for the period post 2020 is currently in the research stage. Until the research is completed it is impossible to prejudge what impact this will have on the Strategic Road network. However, the Strategic Transport Assessment does state “4.8.6 It should be noted that despite these improvements, Figure 4.7 shows the A3 is still operating overcapacity with resulting impacts on congestion.” and “4.5.10 Currently it is unclear why some minor roads in or just outside Guildford town centre are showing increases. These include roads such as Nightingale Road, Denmark Road and Tormead Road. However, it could be related to re-routing occurring as a result of the improvements to the A3 through Guildford attracting drivers to both join the A3 and remain on the A3 at Guildford and weaving through local streets.” Also, at 4.8.3 “At the same time, average vehicle speeds increase not just on the A3 but across the network within the borough as a whole. However, despite this it should be noted that although the average speed across the network in Scenario 5 is higher than in Scenario 1 (the Do-Minimum), there are differences within the network with average speeds on A roads and minor roads lower than in Scenario 1.” In other words, traffic congestion on the local road network is predicted to be worse under this draft Local Plan.

It is possible or indeed probable that no further funding will be available, or that any funding will not meet projected full costs. If this funding is unavailable in full, then this policy should clearly state that projects cannot be developed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

We propose that unless guaranteed public funds are available to cover costs in full, there should be no development of any individual sites of more than 10 homes outside the urban areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13435  **Respondent:** 10800065 / David Thompson  **Agent:**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)**

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5870  **Respondent:** 10800673 / Nigel Rowland  **Agent:**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---

Section page number  Page 85 of 258  Document page number  1381
• I OBJECT to the proposed developments opposite Winds Ridge (policy A44) and Clockbarn Nursery (policy A42) due to the impact that the additional traffic will have on small local roads. The first of these will increase the traffic leaving Send Hill onto Potters Lane at what is already a dangerous junction on very narrow lanes. Meanwhile, Send Road is already frequently blocked by HGVs trying to turn into Tannery Lane; this can only be made worse by additional traffic using the same road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
OBJECT This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.

However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to massive disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to a massive housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

** 1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Policy I2, due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25.

Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away, even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are
in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12368  **Respondent:** 10811681 / Linda Knight  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

14. I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12225  **Respondent:** 10816993 / Jane Roberts  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan. This is clearly a huge flaw in the plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. I object due to the congestion that will be caused to the trunk roads, A3/M25 by the development
The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the time frame of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16683  Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1 I object to policy i2 “Supporting the Department of Transport’s Road Investment Strategy” on the grounds that;

1.2 This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

1.3 The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14491  Respondent: 10846625 / Frank Drennan  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1772  Respondent: 10848513 / Martin Cole  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
3. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plans for improvements. You cannot squeeze modern traffic down lanes that were built for a horse and cart.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no pedestrian footpaths. The new homes will generate dangerous and unsustainable traffic. The historic village of Ripley was given a by-pass to save it for future generations not make its roads into a car park.

Every time there is a problem on the A3/M25 traffic already congests the area to dangerous levels. With the increasing cycle traffic on the Olympic cycle route to the Surrey Hills using the same narrow lanes, this is a recipe for a human disaster.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9802  Respondent: 10853249 / Evan Parry-Morris  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Unsuitability of local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic

Many local roads around the villages of Send, Ripley and Clandon are narrow and there are already many instances of vehicles having to mount pavements to allow large vehicles to pass. This is particularly an issue on the A247 between Burnt Common and Clandon Crossroads. The inclusion of the Garlick’s Arch proposal, particularly the industrial and warehousing elements of the plan, is certain to make the situation far worse. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using narrow roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7179  Respondent: 10854113 / Sarah Pickering  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

WE OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy, as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic
disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to this policy as it stands

Very significant traffic constraints should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
POLICY I2 DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT

I object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but there is no evidence to show that this is a realistic option. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN to constrain the housing target.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I
I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16430</th>
<th>Respondent: 10876033 / Lucie Paulson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to policy I2
- underestimates car usage. Ripley built over 50 units recently. Car parking is impossible now. This is because car ownership was underestimated and so new housing owners park in the car park; and because it is a disproportionately large build for the settlement (ie new house owners swamp the small village car park)

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11017</th>
<th>Respondent: 10878977 / Lisbet Hjort Jensen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A 3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020.I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35),Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25),will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18205</th>
<th>Respondent: 10883201 / Danny McHugh</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 and M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1105</th>
<th>Respondent: 10884993 / Dave Fassom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6851</th>
<th>Respondent: 10889985 / Ruth Macdonald</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13506  **Respondent:** 10890177 / Cheryl Burnside  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15499  **Respondent:** 10894817 / Stephanie Woodford  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate post Brexit, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 and M25 are already severely congested, and would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

9. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

With the proposed building of 5000 homes in the local area the 14,000 throughout the Guildford area the A3 and M25 would have to be improved before any development can be even considered.

Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020.

Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not even be contemplated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15510</th>
<th>Respondent: 10911425 / Andrew Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9107</th>
<th>Respondent: 10914849 / Robert Yates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic will become gridlocked in Send, which is heavily congested already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7221</th>
<th>Respondent: 10915361 / Judy Young</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY I2 – Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’
I OBJECT to this policy which has no reality attached to it and only adds to the congestion of the area without any guarantee of improvement.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12076</th>
<th>Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)
Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14451  Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

14. I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11337  Respondent: 10923297 / Matthew Burnham  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP'S ROAD STRATEGY):

- Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough.
- Out of sync with DTP’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented.
- Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit. Probably won’t happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9008  Respondent: 10928737 / Guy Pashley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11332  Respondent: 10930945 / Peter Perry  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the A3/M25 trunk roads (Policy I2)
The A3 and M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. As no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan, the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not even be considered until it is clear excess road capacity is available for any new development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1724  Respondent: 10933793 / Julia Tilbury  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport's "Road Investment Strategy"

I OBJECT. This policy is too vague and optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people...
square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1696</th>
<th>Respondent: 10933857 / C J Tilbury</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), Sound? ( ), Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15381</th>
<th>Respondent: 10935201 / Cathryn Walton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), Sound? ( ), Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport's "Road Investment Strategy"

I OBJECT. This policy is too vague and optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18084  Respondent: 10939073 / Katie Waldner  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 and M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9612  Respondent: 10940673 / Carolyn Davis  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)**

Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020 and therefore there is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours, see item 2 above, and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12807</th>
<th>Respondent: 10940833 / Natasha Taylor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years after any housing or industrial space is built and the required infrastructure may never be put in place. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13989</th>
<th>Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the impact of further congestion on local village roads and lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9311</th>
<th>Respondent: 10943457 / Henry Benzikie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3055  Respondent: 10952705 / Moira Maidment  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2) I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situation worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15812  Respondent: 10953249 / Charlotte Ladd  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2) I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3
& M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8814  Respondent: 10953921 / Alan Knox  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5942  Respondent: 10956161 / Pauline McCallister  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4651  Respondent: 10957025 / Pauline Masters  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6659  **Respondent:** 10958753 / Ingrid Molossi  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9005  **Respondent:** 10959009 / Rebecca Claridge  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).
Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18404</th>
<th>Respondent: 10959265 / Inger &amp; Ron Ward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18491</th>
<th>Respondent: 10959265 / Inger &amp; Ron Ward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43), and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are likely to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8381</th>
<th>Respondent: 10989601 / Margaret Mew</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8332</th>
<th>Respondent: 10990145 / Anne Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14633  Respondent: 10992225 / Emma Ringshaw  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7409  Respondent: 10992833 / Amanda Verny White  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are likely to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed widening of the M25 will only increase the amount of vehicles being drawn to junction 10 on the A3. The proposed building developments will only worsen the current situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15317  Respondent: 11007393 / James Culmer  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan. There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3970  Respondent: 11008225 / Russell Pascoe  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
& M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7575  Respondent: 11010401 / J M Bates  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2465  Respondent: 11014881 / Linda Peters-Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy 12 - Supporting the Department of Transport's Road Investment Strategy

I object.

The policy is too optimistic and the decisions are a long way off. The schemes are expensive and may not be built.

The draft plan commits to building housing estates in the countryside before these improvements are in place.

The policy will create massive congestion and disruption.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2051</th>
<th>Respondent: 11023585 / Jean Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.1 OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11675</th>
<th>Respondent: 11024257 / Jenny Richardson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2147</th>
<th>Respondent: 11028737 / Sue Kershaw</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate post Brexit, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/711  Respondent: 11029409 / John Lay  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13.) Due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk Roads, A3 / M25 (Policy I2 )

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17823  Respondent: 11033921 / Tim Depledge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object - This policy is written the wrong way round stating housing should take into account the development needs of the A3 / M25. The roads should be upgrade first to prevent gridlock and congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14157  Respondent: 11036289 / Osman Abdullah  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy” This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but there is no evidence to show that this is a realistic option. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.
The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN to constrain the housing target.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15978</th>
<th>Respondent: 11040481 / D G Spratt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate post Brexit, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7338</th>
<th>Respondent: 11041121 / Catherine Dean</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away, even if they ever happen, and are beyond the command of the Council. The draft Plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network.

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the OAN at a much earlier stage in the Plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1905</th>
<th>Respondent: 11041281 / Chris Harlow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11558</th>
<th>Respondent: 11042433 / Sam Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12716</th>
<th>Respondent: 11042433 / Sam Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, if Highways England had identified a need for an additional entrance / exit for the A3 near Ripley, they would compulsory purchase the land required to do so in the best location. They have not done this, nor identified Garlick’s Arch as a site to use.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5504  Respondent: 11043553 / Geraldine Banks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14603  Respondent: 11044129 / Christopher Barrass  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).
Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4873  **Respondent:** 11047329 / Hazel Corstin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. **POLICY I2**

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen.

I object that the draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

I object as there is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12976  **Respondent:** 11047873 / Mary Waldner  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )
1. **POLICY I1**

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.
Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

There is no provision of the increased capacity of Guildford hospital, where is this assessed and remedied?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ()</strong>, <strong>is Sound? ()</strong>, <strong>is Legally Compliant? ()</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of specific A3 options in 4.6.18 noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12328  Respondent: 11054049 / Clare Goodall  Agent:</th>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ()</strong>, <strong>is Sound? ()</strong>, <strong>is Legally Compliant? ()</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>POLICY I2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14254  Respondent: 11061185 / Peter Komisarczuk  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object due to the congestion that these developments will most likely cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I believe the A3 and/or the M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. We are advised that Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020.

I am a user of the A3 and M25 and it is often very congested and already typically adds between 15 to 30 minutes of delay at peak times to my commute. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should therefore not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16745  Respondent: 11070113 / Alison Hague  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2) I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network.
Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan. There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8844</th>
<th>Respondent: 11071553 / Nicholas Roberts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY) – Object since it doesn’t allow for the disastrous increase in traffic that will come from excessive development in the countryside. Green Belt will be lost before road improvements come about, making this policy also out of sequence with the Dept for Transport’s strategy. The road improvements are unlikely to happen anyway after Brexit.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12392</th>
<th>Respondent: 11074465 / Louise Vaughan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this Policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft Plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The
A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6494  **Responder:** 11074561 / Tim Anderson  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY I2**

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14347  **Responder:** 11080097 / David & Julia Hunt  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy” This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but there is no evidence to show that this is a realistic option. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the
construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN to constrain the housing target.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15864  **Respondent:** 11098369 / Neil & Nicki Covington  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

WE OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. We have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6838  **Respondent:** 11114721 / Elizabeth Wilcockson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/18652  **Respondent:** 11119265 / Guildford Environmental Forum (Raymond Smith)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
We consider that there is no objectively assessed need for housing yet established, since the figure used is based on a Strategic Housing Market Assessment that is not transparent in its methodology. Whilst the document has been produced externally to the Council, by established practitioners in the field, and claims to have produced a measure of the “objectively assessed needs” we understand that the methodology used by them is (still) being claimed to be confidential. With the lack of opportunity for peer review of the process, let alone public examination of it, the document and its conclusions cannot be considered to be “objective”. Any plan based on this must be considered to be unsound.

In general there are areas of great concern, for example the delays in providing the necessary infrastructure before any increase in housebuilding (congestion on the A3 is not being addressed until well over 5 years time). Public transport solutions would, however, be far more sustainable than proposals to keep up-grading the A3, which are likely to have limited benefits. There do not seem to be co-ordinated plans for improving air quality, reducing CO2 emissions or preventing biodiversity loss. These sections need to move beyond platitudes. The big increase proposed in retail space is also a negative aspect.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15846  Respondent: 11150913 / Sarah Marshall  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?  ( ) is Sound?  ( ) is Legally Compliant?  ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1133  Respondent: 11151617 / Nigel Tallick  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?  ( ) is Sound?  ( ) is Legally Compliant?  ( )
1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2019  Respondent: 11160001 / Andy Freebody  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2537  Respondent: 11199841 / Woodstreet Village Association (Neville Byran)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The A3 tunnel is not funded and now with the logical North/East access now under a housing estate, it seems this proposal is no longer valid. There are no other options / alternatives outlines.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1665  Respondent: 13594401 / Sarah Haddy  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Car free new developments are completely unrealistic in this age. It would impact negatively on the neighbouring estates. New housing estates and new retail outlets must be built with sufficient parking.
The changes made to the plan do not seem to address any of the concerns for our local environment and our quality of life. Many of the changes do not clarify but leave much open ended and open to interpretation and indeed leave back doors open for worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2440  Respondent: 14177313 / Ian Macpherson  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ); is Sound? ( ); is Legally Compliant? ( )
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para 4.6.18 – am I to understand that the “Tunnel” option is no longer under consideration? If this is the case, the Plan should say so, for much hangs on A3 capacity and implications for works.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4789  Respondent: 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ); is Sound? ( ); is Legally Compliant? ( )

33 POLICY I2 DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT

33.1 I object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

33.2 This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

33.3 The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY):

- Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough.
- Out of sync with DTp’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented.
- Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit. Probably won’t happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Further to this I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). The A3 / M25 junction are already dangerous due to excess traffic and need to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the time frame of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy I2)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy I2)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.) Due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Attached documents: |

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/745  **Respondent:** 15155617 / David Vallath-Patel  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Attached documents: |

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/783  **Respondent:** 15157601 / Barbara Walker  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Attached documents: |

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15539  **Respondent:** 15172641 / Michael Heard  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2).

As it is clear that no improvements to the A3 or M25 would be possible before 2020, no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1534  Respondent: 15177505 / Iain Guest  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The potential increased development would lead to even more traffic using Horsley and Ockham Road North in particular as a cut through to the A3. We have already had numerous incidents with lorries and vans striking pedestrians, striking the railway bridge and driving way above the speed limit. The parish council have complained numerous times but Guildford Council have done NOTHING to address these concerns and therefore the proposed development will make matters even worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/970  Respondent: 15185537 / Peter Mills  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

K. I also object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2).

I politely request that these objections are taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1120  Respondent: 15196097 / Mark Groves and Katie Hamilton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate post Brexit, it is unlikely any
additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1187  Respondent: 15198337 / Jack Tallick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1224  Respondent: 15205729 / John Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1241  Respondent: 15207457 / Robert Erhardt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the traffic congestion that will ensue on trunk roads A23, K, M25 (Policy 12) if development occurs. It is the sensible option to improve road capacity prior to development of any area. If road capacity is not adequate development should not proceed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1248  Respondent: 15207489 / Linda O'Cain  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that proposed development would cause to the trunk roads A3 and M25 (Policy 12) Any proposed development should be preceded by infrastructure improvements. It is foolish to think that funds may be allocated in the future and local communities would be directly adversely affected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16406  Respondent: 15216129 / Timothy Hewlett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1314  Respondent: 15220097 / Douglas Barr Trudy Amos  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. We have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3
& M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13757   Respondent: 15227905 / Nigel Alexander   Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY):
• Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough. 
• Out of sync with DTP’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented. 
• Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit. Probably won’t happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1469   Respondent: 15233889 / Claire Sallows   Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Fourthly, I object due to the congestion that development will cause to both local and larger roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 must be improved before development is done. There are no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020, so rendering the timescales are completely mismatched which means the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common are likely to increase the amount of ‘through’ traffic, including but not limited to more traffic from London/ M25 to Woking routing through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking. This is not sustainable as this cannot be improved and current traffic is heavy for long hours every day.

The roads concerned are of increasingly poor quality and the additional volumes will cause further deterioration, leading to risk of vehicle damage, accidents, especially cyclists, and broader impacts to adjoining land, properties, etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1623   Respondent: 15240161 / R O Moore   Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  

14. The congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

According to Highways England, no real improvements to the A3 or M25 are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I wish the above objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s "Road Investment Strategy"

I OBJECT. This policy is too vague and optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2) The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/1909  Respondent: 15253217 / W Orchard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Coopetore? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1887  Respondent: 15253313 / J.J. Maguire  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object because of the compound effect of development on so many adjoining villages. What I have seen does not properly accommodate this. Bottlenecks will be created. look at the situation when the utilities dig up OR north or OR south. The detour when the bridge was out of action was along roads that were unsuitable. Plus locals used roads like The Drift causing misery to local people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1939  Respondent: 15254113 / R Orchard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2004</th>
<th>Respondent: 15256833 / C J Vickers</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11.I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2099  Respondent: 15264001 / Robert Peake  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11.I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14931  Respondent: 15265377 / Emma Thompson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2136  Respondent: 15265889 / Christine Croston  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11917  Respondent: 15275201 / Jennifer Morritt  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18679  Respondent: 15278465 / Chris Wright  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The RIS includes three strategic road improvement projects comprising improvements to the M25 and improvements to Junction 10 / A3 (the Wisley Interchange), which are anticipated ‘to commence’ in Road Period 1 (2015/16 to 2019/20) and the improvement of the A3 between Guildford and the Hogs Back A31 junction which is anticipated to ‘commence’ in Road Period 2 (by 2024/25).

It is to be noted that the RIS does not consider any improvement of the Ripley junction on the A3 that will serve the Wisley Airfield strategic allocation, or the proposed improvements to the Burpham junction on the A3 that will serve the Gosden Hill Farm allocation. Although the RIS includes improvements to the A3 / A31 junction it is not known how this might assist access to Blackwell Farm. It is assumed, as set out in Policy I1 that improvements to the network generated by the allocations will be funded exclusively by the developers.

Notwithstanding, the above it is clear that, as things stand, the improvements have yet to be agreed between the Council and Highways England and as such the effect of these improvements cannot be taken into account by the developers when assessing the highway implications of their own developments. This could further frustrate delivery of the strategic sites; especially if the Guildford improvements are not ‘anticipated’ to commence until Road Period 2, i.e. possibly not until 2025.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The A3 acts as a mini motorway dividing the town. It used to be the ring road but has not functioned well for a number of years now. Most problems in town traffic stem from something happening elsewhere in the wider roadscape and usually from the A3, where the overuse initiates some sort of problem almost every day. Tinkering with the A3 in my opinion is not going to help - it is fundamentally in the wrong place for current needs and should be moved to flow around the urban area.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse. The section of the A3 between Burnt Common and Burpham is recognised already as a black spot for road traffic accidents. This situation will be made much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the increased congestion on the trunk roads, A3/M25.
The M25 and A3 are overloaded. Highways England has no plans to consider improvements on the A3. No improvements are planned to A3 or M25 before any development is done and this is contrary to the stated aim of the plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2713  
Respondent: 15296545 / Catherine Lees  
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25.

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans in its current schedule even to start considering improving the A3. Many of the main "plans" are "aspirational" (i.e. they have no basis, and should be discounted and excluded).

Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan, so the Plan is undeliverable and developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2763  
Respondent: 15298017 / Margaret Cousins  
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2783  
Respondent: 15298497 / John David Scott  
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. **I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)**

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved **before** any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14232  **Respondent:** 15299201 / Samira Abdullah  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy” This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but there is no evidence to show that this is a realistic option. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN to constrain the housing target.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2834  **Respondent:** 15299425 / Tim and June Yorath  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”**

We object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.
1. I OBJECT due to the congestion development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. **I OBJECT** due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 \& M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2995  **Respondent:** 15304929 / Rosemary Wood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25.

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 \& M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3018  **Respondent:** 15312769 / Norah Johnson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved **before** any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3032</th>
<th>Respondent: 15312961 / Alison Johnson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3053</th>
<th>Respondent: 15314305 / Andrew Dennis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3084</th>
<th>Respondent: 15315009 / Edward Dennis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3446  Respondent: 15340929 / Claire Smylie  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3614  Respondent: 15342401 / M.J. Harris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3751  Respondent: 15345281 / Alexandra Murphy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3789  
**Respondent:** 15348033 / Peter Nicholas  
**Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2).

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3887  
**Respondent:** 15349281 / Steve Aptel  
**Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13651  
**Respondent:** 15349281 / Steve Aptel  
**Agent:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4163  Respondent: 15356801 / Clare Harlow  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4246  Respondent: 15358305 / Frances Hodgson  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4403  Respondent: 15367361 / Greg Ganjou  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4542</th>
<th>Respondent: 15368993 / Tessa Spink</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY I2**

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4610</th>
<th>Respondent: 15370497 / Edward Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**
1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
11. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4836  Respondent: 15377953 / cctvtraining.com ltd (Gordon Tyerman)  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England. It is only reasonable that the council will work closely with Highways England to ensure that the Local Plan does not utilise land in a way that limit the scope for future improvements.

However, the proposals for the A3 are undecided and the council has suggested a very expensive tunnel proposal that, even if HE decided to go ahead with it, is unlikely to be delivered until the end of the plan period. Less expensive alternative A3 improvements would not be delivered before implementation of the current draft Local Plan and would deliver a massive growth in traffic. The road improvements are likely to lead to massive disruption to traffic during the construction phase on top of an already overloaded road network. It would be folly to make matters worse by committing to a massive housing number and the only logical conclusion is that a very significant traffic constraint should be applied to the OAN for this Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4854  Respondent: 15379969 / Teresa Britton  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic...
disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy 12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

** 1. POLICY 12

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 and M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 and M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5395  Respondent: 15390785 / Francesca Molossi-Murphy  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the time frame of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5443  Respondent: 15397953 / Gillian Dobson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the time frame of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity levels during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2).

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5713  **Respondent:** 15406529 / David I Allan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY I2**

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5966  **Respondent:** 15408513 / Brian Rawling  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Reviewing Highways England material, suggests that it has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25. I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

- A3 through traffic needs additional lanes and separation from local traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested.

These narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians AND you have given no consideration to this point.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested.

These narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians AND you have given no consideration to this point.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16844  **Respondent:** 15422145 / Orlando Lee  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6063  **Respondent:** 15422529 / David Roberts  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY I2**

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity and even standstill during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will exacerbate the situation further.

I object to the congestion that development will cause and the lack of road infrastructure. POLICY I2

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

I object to this policy:

I am being asked to buy into something which is so vague and undefined with no defined outcome against which I can form a judgement. It is not what the intention of the work is. Is it to relieve congestion from natural growth or to relieve some or all of the congestion predicted from the Council’s planned growth? Whatever the case, significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft Plan, however, commits to building housing estates along the A3 before any of these road improvements are in place. This will lead to massive traffic disruption. Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the OAN at a much earlier stage in the Plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are likely to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6295  Respondent: 15427969 / Chris Mealing  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6319  Respondent: 15428225 / Vian Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3
& M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6574  Respondent: 15434241 / Valerie Sowerby  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6581  Respondent: 15434273 / Brian Crosby  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done.

The M25 at J10 is blocked virtually every day already but the Highways England includes no measures to improve it before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6721  Respondent: 15437313 / Sarah Gooden  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
TRAFFIC CHAOS

We object to the planned development because it will cause traffic chaos and gridlock. When GBC’s elected councillors voted through the Draft Plan (on 24.5.16) they failed to scrutinise the Strategic Transport Report - a major piece of evidence. (Adjournment was requested so that this vital piece of evidence could be considered but GBC’s councillors failed to allow this).

Surrey County Council’s traffic simulations verify that the level of traffic on our roads is already above the capacity that they were designed for. GBC’s unrealistic growth plans for Normandy and Flexford will force more traffic onto the already congested A3, A323, Cl6 and D60. There is no evidence of secure funding for any improvements to the A3 during the lifetime of the Draft Plan.

The already highly congested road network in and around Normandy/Flexford will grind to a halt at peak times causing significant adverse impact to the daily lives of local residents and small businesses. One major existing traffic congestion issue is the railway arch in Westwood Lane which only allows alternate single lane through traffic. It is already hazardous and a bottleneck for traffic at peak times. There is no capacity to change this in the future. The increased traffic will also cause a massive increase in exhaust pollution with excessive levels of nitrous oxide and carbon dioxide - threatening the health of all residents.

Traffic Black Spots Near Site Access - North end of Parcel of land A46 (Guildford Rd Junction with Westwood Lane).

Access to any development of houses and I or flats at rear of The Old Vicarage, Wyke would cause increased traffic dangers to an already very dangerous junction at corner of Westwood Lane and Guildford Road where there have been several fatalities.

There is also already heavy traffic at the Wyke Primary School across the road from the same junction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6750  Respondent: 15437889 / Janet Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Supporting DfT’s Road Investment Strategy

I support the improvements planned for the A3 through Guildford, which are long overdue.

I object to the CLLR which is not a sustainable way for traffic to reach the A3 and would have disastrous consequences in terms of flooding, habitat destruction, dangerous junctions and noise and air pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6868  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the Local Plan as a whole due to the much increased congestion that will result from the developments on trunk roads, A3/M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10666  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the Local Plan as a whole due to the much increased congestion that will result from the developments on trunk roads, A3/M25. (Policy 12)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6831  Respondent: 15439425 / Abigail Cruse  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The A3 or M25 would have to be considerably improved before any development is done. Highways England has confirmed that they have no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7034  Respondent: 15442049 / Ellouise Fassom  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).
Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7036  Respondent: 15442081 / Lauren Fassom  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7141  Respondent: 15442913 / Inger Scotland  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2) I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years
away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7232  Respondent: 15445793 / Jackie Withers  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14380  Respondent: 15446401 / Louise Yandle  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY):
• Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough.
• Out of sync with DTp’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented.
• Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit. Probably won’t happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
9. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situation worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7528  Respondent: 15449889 / Harriet Bell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7615  Respondent: 15450785 / Georgina Love  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development could be completed. Highways England do not have an plans to look and consider improvements to the A3 until 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the
I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy I2).

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I worry that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situation worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14576</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454881 / Mark Fielder</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is clear that improvements to the M25 and the A3 would be required before any proposed development takes place, this clearly cannot be carried out within the proposed timeframe. Any developments proposed for the Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) sites should not take place without the appropriate improvements to main infrastructure routes. It has been stated by the highways agency that they will not consider improving the A3 until 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15097</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454945 / Claire Cassar</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed timeframe for the development are not aligned with the time it would take to effect improvements to the M25 and the A3. Any developments proposed for the Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) sites need to take account of improvements to main infrastructure routes, ahead of the developments commencing. Highways agency assert that they will not consider improving the A3 until 2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7871</th>
<th>Respondent: 15455233 / Andrew Hamilton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7991</th>
<th>Respondent: 15457505 / Julie Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce
congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I
have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s
Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3
& M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only
make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2).

The A3 would need to be improved to cope with the increased capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours, with horrendous jams frequently occurring, and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I worry that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situation worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8357  Respondent: 15464673 / Trudy Grey  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8413  Respondent: 15466113 / Tim Grey  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
10. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)**

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
4. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 would need to be improved to cope with the increased capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours, with horrendous jams frequently occurring, and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8603  Respondent: 15472097 / Bernard Eyre  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A2S), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8687  Respondent: 15474849 / Timothy Yorath  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

I There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate post Brexit, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTp’S ROAD STRATEGY):
• Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough.
• Out of sync with DTp’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented.
• Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit. Probably won’t happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3
& M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9507  Respondent: 15482817 / C.E. Pullen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9497  Respondent: 15482977 / Craig Robertson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to this policy as it stands. This policy is concerned only with the strategic road network – the A3 and M25 for which the responsibility and decision-making lies with Highways England and will take years to agree and complete. The draft plan commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometer, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9505  Respondent: 15483009 / S Acomb  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9608</th>
<th>Respondent: 15483713 / Claire Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9630</th>
<th>Respondent: 15484033 / Caroline Ali</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic
The local roads in the area are very narrow.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10016  Respondent: 15495649 / Stephen Cruse  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
The A3 or M25 would have to be considerably improved before any development is done. Highways England has confirmed that they have no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10051  Respondent: 15495873 / Gerard Duvé  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Supporting the Dept of Transport's Road Investment Strategy

I object to this policy only relating to the strategic road network, the A3/M25, without ensuring any development includes the necessary road infrastructure being implemented. I object to developers funding road infrastructure which suits their wishes and not the necessary needs, i.e. south bound slip road and north bound sliproads at the Ockham roundabout. Such provision at Burnt Common increases the traffic through Ripley should the 2,000+ houses be built at the former Wisley Airfield. The village already suffers traffic log-jams on a daily basis.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10052  Respondent: 15495873 / Gerard Duvé  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Supporting the Dept of Transport's Road Investment Strategy

**I object** to this policy only relating to the strategic road network, the A3/M25, without ensuring any development includes the **necessary** road infrastructure being implemented. **I object** to developers funding road infrastructure which suits their wishes and not the necessary **needs**, i.e. south bound slip road and north bound sliproads at the Ockham roundabout. Such provision at Burnt Common increases the traffic through Ripley should the 2,000+ houses be built at the former Wisley Airfield. The village already suffers traffic log-jams on a daily basis.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10208</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497505 / Jyoti Nanda</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10312</th>
<th>Respondent: 15500161 / Joanna Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17098</th>
<th>Respondent: 15501217 / Luke Sarti</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10584</td>
<td>Respondent: 15502209 / Shirley Atkinson</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The council appropriately identifies that the enhancement of the A3 is essential to the scale of development possible within the local plan. Page 21 Strategy and sites states 'The delivery of housing in the later stages of the plan period is dependent upon major improvement to the A3 through Guildford'. Highways England have made no commitment to improve the A3 and yet the local plan still seeks to deliver the full housing target through the delivery of three of its four strategic sites sighted directly beside the A3. The transport survey also highlights that traffic will be impacted and congestion worsened irrespective of what improvement measures are put in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10587</th>
<th>Respondent: 15502241 / Richard Atkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12) I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are likely to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan. There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10357  Respondent: 15502817 / Linda Margaret Cutbush  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10540  Respondent: 15504001 / Margaret Banks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy I2 - Supporting the Dept of Transport's Road Investment Strategy

I object to this policy only relating to the strategic road network, the A3/M25, without ensuring any development includes the necessary road infrastructure being implemented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11287  Respondent: 15570209 / Emily Cross  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I2 - Supporting the Dept of Transport's Road Investment Strategy

I object to this policy only relating to the strategic road network, the A3/M25, without ensuring any development includes the necessary road infrastructure being implemented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11272  Respondent: 15570273 / Barnaby Geib  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11293  Respondent: 15570305 / Richard Gray  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)
Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15316</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570817 / Tom Edelsten</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15315</th>
<th>Respondent: 15571201 / Zoe Dudgeon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11465  **Respondent:** 15571425 / Monika Neczaj  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY):

- Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough. • Out of sync with DTP’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented. • Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11492  **Respondent:** 15571553 / Darren Carbine  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy” - I OBJECT.

Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are years away. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, without any plans, designs or specifics. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11512  **Respondent:** 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy” - I OBJECT.

Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are years away. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, without any plans, designs or specifics. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11791</th>
<th>Respondent: 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”**

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are likely to be many years away, even if they ever happen, and are beyond the command of the Council. The draft Plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network.

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the OAN at a much earlier stage in the Plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11525</th>
<th>Respondent: 15571681 / Anne Martin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)**

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11536  **Respondent:** 15571745 / Hazel Thompson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

Furthermore, if Highways England had identified a need for an additional entrance / exit for the A3 near Ripley, they would compulsory purchase the land required to do so in the best location. They have not done this, nor identified Garlick’s Arch as a site to use.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11587  **Respondent:** 15571937 / S Bennell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11744  **Respondent:** 15574337 / Jacqueline Redknap  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at over capacity levels during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11809  **Respondent:** 15574945 / Tim Crook  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11842  **Respondent:** 15575009 / Tony Redknap  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at over capacity levels during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12038  
**Respondent:** 15579137 / Nicodemus Brian Rhyner  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12058  
**Respondent:** 15579361 / Caroline May  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12110  
**Respondent:** 15579649 / Peter E May  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s
Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan. This is clearly a huge flaw in the plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan. This is clearly a huge flaw in the plan.
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12346  Respondent: 15582593 / Dermot McMullan  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12412  Respondent: 15583169 / Poul Jensen  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s...
Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy I2)**

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the
timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12598</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584481 / Jeremy Hamilton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12625</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584641 / Miriam Gilkerson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12645</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584833 / Maria Fort</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12660</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584961 / Helen Meredith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. POLICYI2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy as it fails to address the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads- the A3/M25 (Policy I2). The draft plan commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network. Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that the A3 or M25 will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans even to examine improving the A3 before 2020. I am therefore extremely concerned that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will make the situation far worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12729</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585441 / Laurie Will</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &amp; M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. POLICY II

I OBJECT, due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1).

Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.

I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added accidents, noise, pollution and injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

This policy as it is inappropriate and inadequate and fails to respond to the challenges raised by the proposed significant Green belt developments. The borough’s infrastructure is already heavily strained. However the plan’s determination to build large housing estates across the Guildford countryside significantly increases the need for infrastructure investment without securing the means for its provision. Placing housing in the established urban areas would reduce the need for enhanced infrastructure as would a more realistic housing number.

The policy wording says nothing about roads and traffic. The Council’s methodology for assessing traffic congestion - averaging it over periods of several hours and ignoring the effects of junctions - simply hides the problem, which will get worse as development proceeds. The schemes referred to in this policy will not solve existing congestion and the local road network has not been given sufficient consideration. Some proposed development locations would require highway schemes that are unlikely ever to happen.

Adequate infrastructure provision is a pre-condition of sustainable development. But in this plan it is an afterthought buried away in Policy I1. By prioritizing greenfield over urban, brownfield regeneration, the plan creates insurmountable (and unnecessary) obstacles for itself. Common sense suggests a local plan should first assess the borough’s infrastructure capacity for sustainable development, and then tailor development accordingly. This plan, however, assumes infrastructure will follow on the heels of housebuilding as if by magic. It makes implementation critically dependent on providers outside the Council’s control and on the vagaries of CIL income. Instead of recognizing this as a
key constraint, the plan is based on hope. It is also highly likely that developers faced with the imposition of large infrastructure requirements will go to court to invoke the NPPF provision that prevents authorities from imposing conditions that make a development non-viable.

Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/12768</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15585601 / Sophie Corstin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12787  Respondent: 15585665 / Sophie Thompson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12800  Respondent: 15585793 / Mark Horigan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12955  Respondent: 15586017 / C Maslin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I2 DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT

I object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s ‘Road Investment Strategy’

This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but there is no evidence to show that this is a realistic option. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest.
Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN to constrain the housing target.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12895</th>
<th>Respondent: 15587105 / John Downes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12909</th>
<th>Respondent: 15587137 / John Oliver</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy I2

“The A3 Guildford scheme is subject to feasibility study and then progression through Highways England’s Project Control Framework during Road Period 1. As a result, the scheme could either be the widening of the existing A3 carriageways or a tunnel option”. The most likely north entrance for a tunnel at the north east end of the town would be at Gosden Hill. It is, therefore, absurd to consider building houses on this land until a decision has been reached on whether a tunnel will be built.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy 12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPP16/13139  Respondent: 15588001 / Mary Jane Godfrey  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13149  Respondent: 15588065 / Nick Claxton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13237  Respondent: 15588929 / Alex Hutchings  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).
Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/13371  Respondent: 15590241 / Claire Tallis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13387  Respondent: 15590273 / Eunja Madge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I2

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13469  Respondent: 15590593 / Johnathan Page  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13647  Respondent: 15593729 / Martin Warwick  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13645  Respondent: 15593761 / Celestyn Kwapisiewicz  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13730  Respondent: 15594817 / Toni Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13786  **Respondent:** 15595553 / Carol Davis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to trunk roads and village roads (Policy I2)

There would need to be significant improvements made to the major trunk roads, A3 and M25, prior to any development taking place. It is noted that Highways England has no plans to start improvements on the A3 before 2020. Therefore it would be unsustainable for the huge developments at the Former Wisley Airfield A35, Garlick's Arch A43 and Gosden Hill A25 and the large developments in the Horsleys to take place within the time frame of the Plan.

The villages are already struggling with traffic volume and there is no strategy for improving capacity in the Plan. The road surfaces are in a bad condition, parking is an issue in many of the villages and provision for pedestrians is often poor. Added to this is the increased popularity of cycling which would create more danger for participants with increased traffic.

I wish my objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Local Plan is amended in accordance with the objections raised

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13805  **Respondent:** 15595681 / Willemien Downes  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13828</th>
<th>Respondent: 15596289 / Catherine Bremford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place until a realistic plan is in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13920</th>
<th>Respondent: 15598241 / Madeleine Hewish</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13973</th>
<th>Respondent: 15598721 / Trevor Ottaway</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13980</th>
<th>Respondent: 15598817 / Paul Quy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I Object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads - A3/M25 - (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the scale of development planned, the A3 and M25 would have to be improved before any such development is done. Highways England have no plans to even start considering improvements to the A3 until at least 2020. Clearly, no tangible improvements will be possible in the timeframe of this Plan and so developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) simply should take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14061   Respondent: 15601057 / Chris Vinall   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14097   Respondent: 15601121 / Elspeth Anderson   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situation worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
& M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14152  Respondent: 15601249 / Ann Barrass  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14203  Respondent: 15601473 / Joseph Fort  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14275</th>
<th>Respondent: 15601953 / Stephen Yandle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Out of sync with DTP’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit. Probably won’t happen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14348</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602177 / Julia Hunt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy” This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but there is no evidence to show that this is a realistic option. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN to constrain the housing target.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14411</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602561 / Jonathan Clark</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16483</th>
<th>Respondent: 15603297 / Rony Douek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12). I have already commented on this above. Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place. This is the Green Belt and should be protected from further development, especially as it is already quite overbuilt for being countryside. I request that you take note of my objections and look forwards to receiving an update on the deliberations on this matter. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14512</th>
<th>Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY): • Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough. • Out of sync with DTP’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented. • Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16284</th>
<th>Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY): • Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough. • Out of sync with DTP’s strategy: houses to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented. • Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14550  Respondent: 15603489 / Simon Pitt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14621  Respondent: 15603905 / Michael Douek  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence.

This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)
I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).
Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.
There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14737  Respondent: 15606593 / James Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14738  Respondent: 15606625 / Rebecca Sear-George  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14739  Respondent: 15606657 / Kim Hopwood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy 12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12). Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

**I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)**

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s...
Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate post Brexit, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15124  Respondent:  15610433 / Clare Porter  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15123  Respondent:  15610465 / Tess Corlett  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15187  Respondent:  15610785 / Liz Vinall  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15248  Respondent: 15611137 / Scott Hutchinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15249  Respondent: 15611201 / Jed Alexander  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15314  Respondent: 15612481 / Gillian Culmer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).
Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15423  Respondent: 15614497 / Hannah Yandle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP’S ROAD STRATEGY):
• Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough.
• Out of sync with DTp’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented.
• Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially postBrexit.
Probably won’t happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15551  Respondent: 15616929 / Nigel Wickham  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15598  Respondent: 15617185 / Michelle Mitchell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15632  Respondent: 15618305 / Lawrence Claridge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15631  Respondent: 15618337 / Matthew Pitt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).
Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15681  **Respondent:** 15618881 / Jayne Barmby  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT. This policy is too vague and optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but this is no more than a dream. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN before this consultation, and not left up in the air.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15714  **Respondent:** 15619041 / Jack Cross  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Policy I2 - Supporting the Dept of Transport's Road Investment Strategy**

I object to this policy only relating to the strategic road network, the A3/M25 and not local roads which will be overwhelmed by large developments, regardless of any strategic road network improvement. Wisley will completely overwhelm Ripley and Horsley and the roads will become rat-runs to stations, particularly Woking with its fast trains to London.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15753  **Respondent:** 15623745 / Stella May  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy” This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but there is no evidence to show that this is a realistic option. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN to constrain the housing target.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15810  **Respondent:** 15624577 / Alec Marshall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/18640  **Respondent:** 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16348</th>
<th>Respondent: 15640897 / Jackie van Heesewijk</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to the Department of Transport should be amended to the Department for Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16361</th>
<th>Respondent: 15641281 / Paula Redmond</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT TO POLICY I2 (SUPPORTING DTP'S ROAD STRATEGY): • Doesn’t allow for catastrophic increase in traffic resulting from spreading new housing estates across the borough. • Out of sync with DTP’s strategy: houses to be built and Green Belt destroyed before plans for A3 etc implemented. • Road plans too optimistic anyway, especially post-Brexit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

No consideration has been given to the increase in traffic, congestion, disruption and emissions when combined with Surrey County Council’s plan to start gas extraction and production works nearby at Albury Heath (AONB), which will mean drilling 24/7 for 15 years.

It is understood that the remit of Local Councils does not include consideration of plans outside of it’s area of responsibility, or the cumulative effects, however, it must be for Central Government to oversee all development projects closely enough to establish when there are conflicts of interest. It is irresponsible not to consider the cumulative damaging effects to the locality, the community and the environment as a whole. It is irresponsible to ‘pass the buck’ to other Councils and Government and leave local residents and communities to suffer the consequences of this siloed approach.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16777</th>
<th>Respondent: 15650369 / Stephanie Dean</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY I2 - Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away, even if they ever happen, and are beyond the command of the Council. The draft Plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network.

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the OAN at a much earlier stage in the Plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16805</th>
<th>Respondent: 15652833 / Don Babington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16941</th>
<th>Respondent: 15658145 / Waverley Borough Council (Elizabeth Sims)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policies 12 - Supporting the Department for Transport's "Road Investment Strategy" and 13 - Sustainable transport for new developments

Waverley and Guildford Borough Councils have worked closely recently with each other on transport issues, for example by jointly commissioning Surrey County Council to produce the 2016 Strategic Highway Assessment to inform both authorities' Local Plans. The RIS schemes for improvements to the A3 will have an indirect, but nonetheless important impact on the Strategic Road Network as it affects Waverley. The Council would therefore wish to add its support to that of Guildford Borough for the RIS as well as recognising the need for continued liaison between the Boroughs, the Highways Authority and Highways England on the nature and timescales of the A3 improvements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17125  Respondent: 15666625 / Anna Ruddy  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12)

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17270  Respondent: 15674689 / Chris Baker  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object as the Local Road network, particularly around the villages of Ockham and Wisley, cannot cope with the current local traffic within the area. Most of the local roads are single lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2) The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17480  Respondent: 15687201 / Mandy Cox  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2) The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17620  Respondent: 15688481 / Sally Lescher  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy i2 Supporting the Department of Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy” This policy is too vague and unrealistically optimistic. Decisions by Highways England on improving the strategic road network (the M25 and A3) are still years off. The Council have suggested a very expensive tunnel under Guildford, but there is no evidence to show that this is a realistic option. Even if Highways England accepted this (which is highly unlikely in the post-Brexit public spending climate) it would not be built until the end of the plan period at the earliest. Other, less expensive A3 improvements, and changes to the Junction 10/Heathrow stretch of the M25, will also take years to agree and complete.

The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is foolhardy. Surrey is the most congested county in England, with 683 people per square kilometre, compared with an English average of 413. This policy will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone). This is a major development constraint that should have been applied to the OAN to constrain the housing target.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17715  **Respondent:** 15698017 / Katie Taylor  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 and M25 are already severely strained at the junctions closest to Ripley. The scale of development in the Local plan, particularly for the sites at Garlick’s Arch and Wisley Airfield (A35) is such that there will be unprecedented increases in traffic on these routes. I have been unable to identify adequate evidence of the plans in place to address the likely impacts on key trunk roads resulting from the scale of developments proposed in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17881  **Respondent:** 15705729 / Martyn Heard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

As it is clear that no improvements to the A3 or M25 would be possible before 2020, no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17886  **Respondent:** 15705761 / David Jenner  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of planned road infrastructure. (Policy I1). I live on the Portsmouth Road which runs through Ripley and Send adjacent to Garlick's Arch. We are already coping with large amounts of traffic which is often diverted onto our road when an accident closes the A3. The A3 from the junction north of the village to the M25 is almost at a standstill during the rush hour both going north in the morning and coming south in the evening. All of the above developments are sited along the A3 and with the number of houses proposed probably in the region of an extra 5000 cars will be wishing to use our local roads. Congestion will be even worse and at present Highways England has no plans to start considering improving the A3 before 2020. There should therefore be no development until this has been considered (Policy I2).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/18321  **Respondent:** 15717153 / David Martyn  **Agent:**
I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/18476  Respondent: 15724673 / Matthew Bell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy 12).

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18475  Respondent: 15724801 / Talei Fawcett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy 12).

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18513  Respondent: 15725409 / Nicholas Ward  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12).

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/17195  Respondent: 15746081 / Highways England (Patrick Blake)  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

[Highways England made a formal representation on 18 July 2016. See the first attachment for this representation including comments on this element of the consultation documents and/or associated evidence base.]

Highways England made further comments on 5 October 2016 following a clarification meeting with Guildford Borough Council. See the second attachment for this letter.]

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

- Highways England letter 18 July 2016 - Representation to consultation.pdf (7.7 MB)
- Highways England letter 5 October 2016 - Further comments following clarification meeting with GBC.pdf (1.2 MB)

### Comment ID: pslp171/3529  Respondent: 15746081 / Highways England (Patrick Blake)  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**POLICY ID2: SUPPORTING THE DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT'S “ROAD INVESTMENT STRATEGY”**

Our letter dated 5 October 2016 sets out Highways England comments on Policy ID2 and specifically its position on a potential A3 and planned M25 schemes, which remain the current position. However you will note that subsequent to a public consultation earlier this year, we plan to announce the preferred route for the M25 Junction 10 scheme in late August. This may or may not have implications for proposals set out in policies A43A (Burnt Common) and A35 (Wisley Airfield) can be delivered.

We are pleased to advise that on the 10th March 2017 the Department of Transport announced £220 million to help motorists to beat congestion and this included schemes for the A3 Guildford Northbound Off Slip at the University Interchange and A3 Guildford Stoke Interchange Southbound Off Slip Improvements. Further, we can also advise that schemes at Beechcroft Drive and for Safety Enforcement Cameras on the A3 through Guildford have been funded to enable progress with the intention to start construction before 2020.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: pslp171/1255  Respondent: 15805601 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Sir or madam)  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
The removal of item 4.6.17 is puzzling. In the rationale for changes it is described as a potential statement of common ground with Highways England. GBC believe that it is likely to be agreed nearer to the plan Examination – but once again it highlights the lack of control over key roads infrastructure in formulating the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp171/1603</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>17406209 / Guildford Vision Group (Andrew Black)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY ID2 - Supporting the Department for Transport's 'Road Investment Strategy'

3.70 As already set out in this consultation response, GVG has concerns that the local plan is silent on the plans and delivery aspirations of other key stakeholders such as Highways England.

3.71 An example of this is where the text in paragraph 4.6.17 has been removed, relating to the agreement of a statement of common ground between GBC and Highways England. In the summary of changes to the Local Plan it is suggested that this text has been removed as this will be agreed closer to the Examination. This position is concerning, as the impact of development upon the A3 and road infrastructure is critical in the development of the Local Plan and it is therefore vital that this is agreed at consultation stage if the Plan is to be found sound. Furthermore, if the A3 is improved as proposed, there will be clear potential for increased north-south traffic through the town and surrounding villages getting to and from the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 615.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Policy ID3 - Sustainable transport for new developments
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14933  Respondent: 8555489 / Alan Norris  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford station - new road bridge over railway.

Land immediately to the north of the station should be left undeveloped to allow for a road bridge to be constructed as part of a link road between Guildford Park Road and York Road. This would provide an alternative route to Farnham Road bridge to connect the west and east sides of the town on either side of the railway and river. If the gyratory system is downgraded to reduce town centre congestion and traffic across Farnham Road bridge is restricted to buses and emergency vehicles (as I have read in some transport proposals), then there will be no alternative route for motorists to travel across Guildford apart from using the A3 between Woodbridge Road and the Cathedral junction. These traffic proposals assume that motorists from the west side of the town can park near the station (e.g. Guildford Park Road and Farnham Road car parks) and walk into the town centre. This may be acceptable if their destination is in the lower part of the town centre, but it is a significant distance to walk to the upper part of the town, particularly for those with impaired mobility. The withdrawal of the town centre free bus service a few years ago was a retrograde step.

For traffic in the opposite direction - e.g. residents from the east side of the town and the A281 corridor going to and from the Royal Surrey Hospital and the University, both significant destinations, would also have to use the congested A3 for one junction if access over Farnham Road bridge is restricted and there is no alternative road across the railway in the vicinity of the town centre. It is unsatisfactory that local traffic has to use the A3 for a short distance between the Woodbridge Road junction and the Cathedral / University junction, thus causing regular congestion at peak hours. It is therefore imperative that passive provision is made in the Local Plan for an alternative road bridge over the railway to relieve Farnham Road bridge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18104  Respondent: 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments

4.6.24 The Sustainable Movement Corridor will provide a priority pathway

The impact on non-prioritised users and knock-on effects for surrounding roads need to be assessed.

Object: Inadequate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The change from ‘will expect’ to ‘will be required’ in point (2) is supported. The similar revised wording in point (7) is also supported.

The lack of specificity about the Sustainable Movement Corridor makes it difficult to make an informed comment on point (3).

It is very likely that the claims made for the SMC exceed what can be delivered, and the plan should be based on realistic forecasts and a sound business case.

Para 4.6.24 states the aim and means of implementing the SMC. The provision of the corridor should be ‘subject to a sound business case’.

We oppose the very open-ended new policy on new public car parks without assurances on design and character or clarity on whether this relates to expansion of existing or conversion from another use. Interceptor car parks could be close to residential areas or landscape features and not all sites will be suitable. They could require careful siting and design.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---


Provision of a “shoppers bus” that would serve all of the town centre and the adjacent residential area is vital to reduce car journeys to the centre. Drastic improvement to pedestrian facilities for those walking to the centre is also needed.

We support provision of off-street parking for residential developments; this ought also to be an objective for the established areas of older small houses that have no on-site parking of their own. However for non-residential developments located in and around the town centre this is not appropriate; it negates the whole objective of location to allow use of sustainable transport by employees and clients.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Transport

West Horsley bus service through the village is extremely limited and only operates twice a day Monday to Friday.

Horsley, inadequate parking spaces, and Effingham Junction have frequent trains to London and Guildford 7 days a week. The early commuter trains are usually full from Guildford on arrival at Horsley and returning from London evening rush hours. You could be standing the entire journey.

Traffic generation from the proposed housing plan would be considerable affecting station traffic movement to/from Horsley and children getting to school. There is no land available for more car park spaces.

I walk; lead walks in the Surrey villages and green belt area often meeting and talking to schoolchildren during May & June from Surrey and the London area taking part in the Duke of Edinburgh Award for all young people to develop skills for life and work, fulfill their potential and have a brighter future.

The London children enjoying opportunities never experienced before are so excited all so keen marveling at seeing the beautiful Surrey villages and countryside, often asking questions about the area.

Infrastructure - Roads

Green Lane and most of the roads in and around West Horsley are very narrow, full of potholes often perilous, particularly when large GBC vehicles collecting refuse, garden rubbish, large lorry’s buses and tractors passing through.

The council has failed to properly maintain the roads. Occasional attempts are made ‘to make do and mend some of the potholes, but they are beyond the state which could support a significant increase in traffic.

To increase such traffic which would result if the proposed developments were to proceed would be wholly irresponsible.

Conclusion

Our generation must not leave a legacy such as this of a concrete jungle.

When the next generation can only look in books and see green fields, character historic Surrey villages - as history and say:

THIS IS HOW IT WAS IN THE OLDEN DAYS.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1885</th>
<th>Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY ID3 – Sustainable transport for new developments

ssss) Paragraph 4.6.20 is correct but seems contradictory when viewed against the removal of site A47 at Wanborough Station, whilst retaining sites A42 and A43 at Send.

tttt) We accept the revised wording to Policy ID3(1).
uuuuu) We accept the revised wording to Policy ID3(2).

vvvvv) We understand the rationale of Policy ID3(3).

wwwww) Lengthy statements from 4.6.22 to 4.6.27 indicate clear objectives towards ModalShift, including, in 4.6.24: ‘The Sustainable Movement Corridor will provide a priority pathway through the urban area of Guildford for buses, pedestrians and cyclists, serving the new communities at Blackwell Farm, SARP and Gosden Hill Farm including the new Park and Ride site, the new Guildford West (Park Barn) and Guildford East (Merrow) rail stations, the Onslow Park and Ride, both of the University of Surrey’s campuses, the town centre and Guildford rail station. The aim is for journeys to be rapid and reliable by bus and safe and direct on foot and by bike.’ However, these are followed by 4.6.28 which states: ‘Whilst the site allocations and proposals in this Plan – including the significant programme of schemes to provide and improve opportunities to use active modes, bus and rail – are intended to result in a modest modal shift over the period to 2034, we forecast that there will also be an absolute increase in overall traffic volumes.’ And then in 4.6.30a: ‘Roads in Guildford town centre carry high volumes of traffic and are subject to recurrent traffic congestion during peak periods, especially the gyratory and its immediate approaches. Over the weekday hours of 07:00-19:00, around a quarter of car trips passing through the Guildford gyratory either begin or end at a public car park in the town centre.’

xxxxx) These two statements accurately describe not only the dire existing situation with traffic in Guildford but also recognise that volumes are expected to increase to make matters worse. The last underlined sentence, though, is totally misleading, as is the suggestion, later in the paragraph, that increasing peripheral parking capacity will make a significant difference, thus diverting attention from the main issue.

a. Firstly, the statement refers to cars only, and

b. secondly, it refers to an average over the 12 hours of a weekday. As stated below, under Parking, peak hour behaviour is totally different, so it can be expected that a large proportion of the Town Centre parking would be by shoppers at off-peak times.

c. Thirdly, it identifies this behaviour with 25% of car trips through the gyratory, totally omitting any data or measures to deal with the remainder, to total over 2500 vehicles per hour, including heavy goods vehicles, at peak in 2011.

yyyyy) We believe that, by including Bridge Street, Onslow Street and Woodbridge Road - where these traffic flows occur - as part of the SMC, its objective to: ‘provide a priority pathway through the urban area of Guildford for buses, pedestrians and cyclists, . . . and . . . for journeys to be rapid and reliable by bus and safe and direct on foot and by bike’ is unlikely to be achievable without significantly more serious investment aimed at diverting major through traffic away from this artery.

zzzzz) We do not believe the wording of Policy ID3(4) is workable or able to promote goodneighbourliness, and we consider a more appropriate way to address this is to promote the use of car clubs where there are limited resident parking bays available, with all new developments required to establish a car club or join an existing one which is or will also be available to existing residents. This can supplement or replace ID3(6).

aaaaa) In terms of Policy ID3(5), the Guildford Society considers there needs to be a completerethinking of the way town centre parking (on street and in car parks), park & ride and public transport interact. For example: A return bus fare from Onslow Village costs £4.50 per person (assuming no pensioners); a return fare (including parking) from Onslow Park & Ride costs £1.50 per person return; Parking in York Road car park costs £2 for 2 hours plus £1 per hour thereafter. For a family of three, there is no point getting the bus at £13.50 return; the Park & Ride would cost £4.50; for £4.00 the family could drive into town and park in the York Road car park for up to four hours and still save money. If the price of rail travel from the proposed new Guildford West railway station is similar to travelling from Shalford, a fare of around £2.60 per person before railcard discounts, would suggest that the similar journey would cost £7.80. This illustrates the complete lack of a coherent transport and parking strategy, which will fail to alleviate the traffic and transport problems in and around Guildford.

bbbbbb) We strongly urge the Borough Council to consider expanding the Park & Ride network and to consider running services through the town centre from one Park & Ride facility to another so as to enable a greater number of stops in the town centre to be serviced by a single bus.
We commend Guildford Borough Council's Parking Strategy. However, as we commented to them in August 2016, when the draft was first published, no analysis has been made of the timing of off-street parking usage. We believe that it is important to distinguish between activity during peak times, when travel to and from work and schools is key, and other times when visitors and shoppers display totally different patterns of behaviour and are more likely to use town centre car parks.

The wording of Policy ID3(7) needs some greater clarity. We think we understand what the policy is driving at but we are not sure. This indicates a need for a rethink, although we believe the substance is broadly appropriate.

We have already highlighted issues we have with the change from ‘Developer Contributions’ to ‘Developer Funded’ in the Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C. We note the requirement of Policy ID3(8) and reiterate our caution that this may be part of a gamble intended to avoid development altogether rather than to enable it.

We broadly agree with the amended wording of Policies ID3(9), ID3(10) and ID3(11).

We broadly support the content of most paragraphs following the Policy.

We are concerned about the apparent finality of the text in paragraph 4.6.28 which seems to suggest both that there is a need for more infrastructure and that all necessary infrastructure has already been identified in Appendix C. We fundamentally disagree with this notion because planning for the entire town centre (infrastructure included) is missing from the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp171/2030  **Respondent:** 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  **Agent:**  

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The first point to make regarding infrastructure is that there is a colossal amount of additional or revised evidence referred to in the Local Plan directly, and the evidence base indirectly, which makes like-for-like comparison very difficult and which should place additional burden on the Council to explain the impact, and to ensure the remainder of the evidence and the plan in general relates well to the amendments. The Council has done none of these things.

Consequently, the Society has attempted to review the entire infrastructure evidence.

**TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT**

As part of the process of understanding the proposed infrastructure framework and its place in (a) justifying the level of development, and (b) enabling it, the Guildford Society organised a transport open day in the Guildhall in Guildford High Street.

The pivotal problems with the town centre’s traffic infrastructure, and, to a substantial extent this ripples out into the alternative road transportation network, stem from the limitations of the gyratory system.

Traffic data is generally inconsistently gathered and presented, and there is no long-term Data capture that is publicly available other than monitoring by Google, TomTom and INRIX. The latter have identified the following:

**INRIX REPORT EXTRACT and Source – Attached at Annex 4**
Academic environmental studies demonstrate the way this impacts the air quality in the town centre – in particular those below where data was collected in Guildford:

KUMAR REPORT EXTRACT and Source – Attached at Annex 3

In terms of the gyratory system, we have read many reports and Council papers relating to the congestion and shortcomings of the system, particularly at peak hours – not many of these documents have been retained as part of the evidence base which, therefore, has the impression of a selective exercise designed to justify the plan and not the other way around.

As a consequence, there is no cohesive plan for the town centre traffic in the Draft Submission Local Plan. Guildford Borough Council seem to be gambling on an outside bet – namely, that (a) the A3 will be fixed soon enough in the Plan period; and (b) most traffic will use the A3 instead of travelling through the town centre.

The Guildford Society recognises that there is at least some sense in the premise that the A3 has been at or near peak capacity at rush hours for the past twenty years or so, and that some traffic will rat run through the town centre and other surrounding roads. It is desirable that the A3 be urgently addressed.

The Society does not, however, believe that failing to tackle the town centre in the meantime is in any way sustainable, and that any development in the Borough might be considered unsustainable in the context of NPPF in the absence of a proper plan to fix the traffic in the town centre.

From the Society’s perspective, there is a major long-term issue in the town centre, namely, that the traffic canyon and so-called ‘concrete collar’ making up the gyratory system in Onslow Street and Friary Bridge, Park Street and Bridge Street respectively.

One of the key challenges for the gyratory system is the fact there are several short lengths of road between traffic lights which do not accommodate any reasonable capacity.

Another challenge to analysing the system is that, despite there being several lanes in places, it is often the case that one lane is gridlocked whilst others are all but empty. At various times of day, it is a different lane that is full by comparison to the others.

There is much that could be done in the short term to alleviate the traffic problems by co-ordinating traffic lights and reorganising lanes. It is hard to see that any short-term measures will enable a better and safer environment for cycling. They will also not do much to allow for more efficient scheduling of buses, and will not enable capacity in the town centre to facilitate the proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor.

Consequently, the Council has put forward a Draft Submission Local Plan that does not show that it can be delivered comprehensively. A plan in which only some parts are viable cannot in reality be considered a sound plan.

The Guildford Society endorses the Guildford Vision Group approach to traffic in the town centre and its accommodation of increased freedom of bus and cycle movement to enable modal shift and to redistribute traffic away from the heart of the town and riverside.

There would need to be careful design and co-ordination of signals for the junctions but there seem to the Society, given all we have read and studied over many years, to be very real merits and ample reasons to safeguard the route in order to at least bring more of the traffic and transport infrastructure within the control of the Local Planning Authority.

On Saturday 15th July, the Guildford Society – with invitations to, and rejections from the Deputy Leader of Guildford Borough Council who is the lead member for infrastructure, and the Head of Strategic Projects – held a public workshop in the Guildhall in Guildford High Street, aimed at exploring alternative transportation options in the town. This was intended to begin a public conversation about the issues and canvass views of the bus station, cycling, bus routes and trains.

The information displays and stands included:
1. A ‘best guess’ at the proposed location of the relocated bus station (discussed and approved at an ‘in camera’, closed session of a Council meeting a couple of weeks previously):

2. A display showing concepts for the bus station relocation – largely ignored by the ‘stakeholder exercises’ conducted ARUP and Systra:

3. Guildford Vision Group’s plan and images – including its fly-through model:

4. Guildford Bike User Group (GBUG)

5. Guildford’s Bus Companies, represented by Compass and Safeguard

6. Guildford Borough Council’s Sustainable Movement Corridor plan (in the absence of Guildford Borough Council we adopted plans from the Local Plan and Evidence Base.

7. Illustration of future rail options.

8. An aerial photo of Guildford for attendees to put post-it notes with any location-specific comments.

Looking in greater detail at the GVG plan, we have the following observations as this relates directly to (a) the absence of Town Centre planning in the Regulation 19 Submission Draft Local Plan; and (b) as it relates to the ability to quantify development in the town centre in the context of the Regulation 19 plan.

Assuming traffic at 11th June 2011 levels (when the Sky High Traffic Studies were undertaken for Surrey County Council), we have no better information other than consider it reasonable to assume that the origins and destinations onto and off the town centre road system would be broadly the same.

Looking at the existing gyratory system, we have allocated the traffic to lanes based on the current layout (diagram on the next page):

We have then calculated the traffic through each lane (table below): [Table]

The key lanes from which the table was compiled are set out below, followed by two traffic graphs and a summary of the traffic on each short stretch of the gyratory: [Image]

The main finding from this exercise is the disparity between lanes, for example between the four lanes on Friary Bridge. Lane 4 is for traffic heading for the A31 where there is a dysfunctional pedestrian and vehicular traffic light that does not interact with its fellow traffic signals, causing a back-up onto the gyratory: [Table] [Image].

Equally, in Onslow Street, there is a considerable volume of traffic throughout the day (lane 28 is heading towards the A281 where there is a dysfunctional pair of pedestrian crossings that cause a build-up of traffic on the gyratory: [Table] [Image].

The volume of vehicles in morning and evening peak traffic is substantial and it is not clear how such volumes can be accommodated alongside the proposed town centre stretch of the Sustainable Movement Corridor.

Along Friary Street (needing to run in both directions) the traffic is never lower than 450 vehicles per fifteen minutes – 1,800 per hour – and currently peaks in the morning and evening at 2,500 vehicles per hour.

We have attempted to understand the data and apply it to the local plan proposals. We do agree this will improve by implementing the proposed changes to car park access at Millbrook. A similar approach to Bedford Road Car Park would improve this still further.

In the absence of any real impact assessment on town centre traffic, we really only have one other alternative to model the traffic against, and that is the proposal of the Guildford Vision Group. In the model below, it is clear that traffic on Park Street (A-B) and the new road B-C and C-D will be at a similar level to the current two-direction traffic on Onslow Street, but it will be the junctions that determine whether the town centre can keep moving.
The Guildford Vision Group plan will allow the town centre portion of the Sustainable Movement Corridor to be implemented and would route traffic away from the area.

Working through the analysis and the Guildford Vision Group draft master plan, it seems the road network can work well, given the following assessment:

First, here is the layout proposed by GVG marked with the four junctions that replace seven junctions on the existing gyratory system with much longer legs between junctions than the current arrangement: [Image]

We have assessed the junction movements for the above as set out below: [Image]

We have then assessed the anticipated traffic flows for each traffic movement (recognising that (a) there is no differentiation between vehicle types in the original survey, (b) changed layouts will almost certainly change behaviours, (c) there is no data for traffic stopping at town centre car parks, and (d) the data was zeroed out for vehicles using the gyratory to effectively make a U-turn). [Table]

This table is calculated from data for each 15-minute slot from 7am to 7 pm on 11th June 2011. [Image]

The most traffic-intensive stretches of road are the new roads and Park Street – the highest volume is southbound alongside the station between 4.30 and 5.30pm at 1589 vehicles per hour (26.5 vehicles per minute). There will inevitably still be peak hours congestion but the greater simplicity of the system and junctions should allow this to be minimised in a way the current system cannot.

The Guildford Society believes this is a critical component of enabling the town to accommodate growth and to cope with the growth in surrounding areas. It will be possible to mitigate some of that growth by resolving issues on the A3 and by encouraging modal shift.

GUILDFORD TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2017
This declares itself as an aspirational document and we consider its objectives to be commendable. The substance, however, relies heavily on the delivery of the Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC). We entirely support the concept of the SMC but have serious concerns about its ability to function effectively as currently conceived alongside existing unmitigated traffic volumes (especially when adjusted to accommodate for growth). See our comments specifically at Policy ID3(3). We broadly agree with the traffic analysis carried out by the Guildford Residents’ Associations (GRA).

From a FoI response (Annex 5) we are aware that analysis of the impact of 1,800 homes at Dunsfold showed an increase of an average 110 cars per hour in the three-hour morning peak. A planned increase in housing in the plan period of 12,426 homes in the borough plus fifteen to twenty thousand in the influencing neighbouring boroughs will mean (mathematically) we may need to plan for an additional 1,800 cars per hour in the absence of suitable transport alternatives. Even if a fraction of this number actually reaches the current gyratory system, Guildford will fail to cope and the town will lose ground to Woking and other centres.

(Please Refer to Diagrams on uploaded Rep)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17447</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563201 / West Horsley Parish Council (Sam Pinder)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I3 – Sustainable transport for new developments

Report page: 18

WHPC view: Neutral

In brief: Practicality and enforceability is questioned. Policy wording is weak, e.g. We will expect … should be replaced by We will require...

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: pslp171/2359 | Respondent: 8563201 / West Horsley Parish Council (Sam Pinder) | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy No. and title</th>
<th>2016 WHPC position</th>
<th>2016 WHPC comment in brief</th>
<th>2017 WHPC position</th>
<th>2017 WHPC comment in brief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I3 – Sustainable transport for new developments</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Practicality and enforceability is questioned. Policy wording is weak, e.g. <em>We will expect</em> … should be replaced by <em>We will require</em>…</td>
<td>Support in principle</td>
<td>Now Policy ID3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy extensively rewritten and strengthened. The key will be to get formal commitment before planning approval from the developer, housebuilding company or applicant to all that is considered necessary by the parish where the Site is and GBC as Planning Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/7491 | Respondent: 8565089 / D Tucknott | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

Please note the following:-
1. A320 from the north - during periods of high volume, traffic currently tails back to the Woking Road/ Clay Lane Junction and beyond.
2. A3 South/North bound. The A3 through Guildford is already not fit for purpose for a major trunk road carrying traffic from London to Portsmouth & Southampton with its 50MPH speed limit, twist and turns leading to constant traffic jams and numerous accidents. The only solution would be to build a tunnel similar to the one at Hindhead.
3. A246 from the east - during periods of high volume, traffic currently tails back to the Epsom Road/Trodds Lane junction.
4. A281 from the south - during periods of high volume, traffic currently tails back half way to Shalford.
5. A3100 from Godalming - during periods of high volume, traffic currently tails back to Artington.
6. A31 from the west - during periods of high volume, traffic currently tails back half way along the Hogs Back
7. A323 from the north west - during periods of high volume, traffic currently tails back to the Aldershot Road/ Gravets Lane Junction.
8. A322 from the north-west - during periods of high volume, traffic currently tails back to the Salt Box Road/ Worplesdon Road Junction.

I do not see any proposed plans to improve the infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3167  Respondent: 8568193 / Miss Edwina Attwood  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12.I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/286  Respondent: 8571521 / Surrey Nature Partnership (Sarah Jane Chimbwandira)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We welcome and support this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
In the Sunday Times (10.07.2016) Guildford was extolled as a marvellous place to live “surrounded by glorious and protected countryside – but the A3 runs through it like an ugly scar- that gets annoyingly busy though there is talk of burying it in a tunnel”. However in this plan so much of the countryside in the Green Belt is now apparently being offered up for development while little is being done to ease congestion and prevent the town from becoming crammed. Given there is only limited time to make specific comments we wish to make the following points.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments

I object for the following reasons.

94. I support the general idea of sustainable transport but have the following criticisms and comments on this policy and certain criticisms also apply to the proposals for the Sustainable Movement Corridor.

95. Guildford Borough Council hope that far more residents will prefer to ride bicycles, walk much longer distances, or make greater use of buses and park and rides. This is totally unrealistic and ignores residents’ actual needs and the deteriorating state of bus service provision.

96. The proposed provision of two new railway stations could have unintended consequences such as increased commuter traffic nearby and a need for onerous parking restrictions or inconvenience for local residents from commuter parking. It might also lead to impacts on the housing market local to the station, driving up prices with adverse consequences on affordability and any social housing.

97. I am concerned about proposals to move cyclists off the road and into space shared with pedestrians. This simply replaces one risk with another and is likely to be the cause of accidents – particularly where pedestrians, including schoolchildren and mothers with toddlers, need to cross the path of cyclists to reach a pedestrian crossing. Pedestrians should not have to worry about cyclists approaching from behind at speeds approaching 30mph (as many cyclists on modern machines are easily capable of). Children, in particular, can make unexpected moves across a shared area without thinking about other pavement users in the vicinity. Conflicts over who has priority are also likely to arise whatever signage is in place. Pedestrians are being seriously disadvantaged by this approach.

98. If the policy is successful in generating more trip choices by bicycle the immediately obvious environmental advantages have to be weighed against the impact on those parts of the Local Road Network where cycle lanes do not exist. The impact is that safe driving will lead to reduced average motor vehicle speeds and gap development in the traffic stream. Both these effects act to reduce the capacity of our local road network. This loss of capacity has not been recognised in the Transport Strategy.

99. The benefits of park and ride for the town centre have to be weighed against the traffic that they may generate elsewhere and the vast area of tarmac needed to accommodate them in a Borough where space is under great pressure. In particular, it is not acceptable, and does not fit in with the principle of sustainability, to tarmac over large areas of...
greenfield land for this purpose - or to use brownfield sites without putting building uses over the top of them. We cannot go on wasting precious space in this way.

100. Inserting of villages and the proposed relaxation of planning restrictions anywhere inside or outside settlements (Green Belt or not), implied in P2, will lead to substantial infilling that will not require traffic assessment but will contribute a highly significant amount of additional car journeys overall - by a more insidious process than the large developments proposed.

101. The obvious site choice for sustainable development would be on brownfield sites in the town but the Local Plan proposes allocating those sites to the declining retail industry instead.

102. Paragraph 4.6.21 suggests that sustainable transport is promoted. Far from providing sustainable transport this Plan will generate a massive increase in motor vehicle journeys. The Plan cannot force residents to ride bicycles or walk everywhere and most of the proposed housing sites will generate large numbers of vehicle journeys due to their greenfield locations. Wisley (Site A35) is a classic example of traffic generation through inappropriate location.

103. Paragraph 4.6.26 refers to reviewing existing transport facilities and likely transport generation as part of assessing the amount of incremental travel demand. That consideration should have taken place in a robust and detailed manner on a site-by-site basis before the sites were allocated in the Local Plan. It is not sufficient to leave that until the planning application stage, as intended by Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council, given that all sites will be subject to “permission in principle” under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and so will not be capable of subsequent rejection on these grounds.

104. Paragraph 4.6.27 notes that Development must mitigate its transport impacts. The measures described rely entirely on residents responding positively to their travel information packs rather than dumping them in the nearest bin. It seems that Guildford Borough Council, in response to concerns about elderly and disabled people failing to be coerced into riding bicycles are now suggesting tricycles to overcome this obstacle to their aspirations. They should be aware that while tricycles may help with balance issues they are heavier and harder to ride uphill. While the policy (unusually) notes that mitigation must be provided, in fact this is then diluted to suggest that facilities for electric car charging points and encouragement to car-share can be sufficient; all are optional and therefore meaningless.

105. However well designed a development is it will make matters worse during construction and, if on a greenfield site, it is hard to see how it will achieve environmental benefits. On the other hand, replacing inefficient buildings on a brownfield site could lead to benefits in the long term.

106. Paragraph 4.6.28 notes “Developers should have regard” to the “Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C”. The only thing that developers have regard for is forcing their application through and maximising their profit – that is the business they are in.

107. Appendix C is lacking in detail. It notes, for example that there will be new town centre bus facilities at a cost of £5-10 million – such vagueness make it clear that no real costing or analysis of proposals has been prepared, and that the Infrastructure improvements proposed have not been properly considered. Having regard to fluid and uncertain proposals is effectively meaningless as a constraint or a requirement.

108. Paragraph 4.6.29 requires that applications need to address the transport implications of the proposed development. Experience with recent planning applications suggests that developers will do everything in their power to understate transport impacts and I have no faith in Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council taking a sufficiently robust line on this.

109. Key Evidence is missing or inadequate.

I described the inadequacies of the transport assessment earlier in this letter.

Some examples in connection with sustainability from the **Guildford Borough Transport Study 2016**: 

---

**Guildford Borough Transport Study 2016**
110. The decision on Heathrow or Gatwick has yet to be taken but airport expansion in the south-east cannot be regarded as sustainable development and, although Guildford Borough Council has no control over such external decisions, its own forced growth agenda will drive a need for that expansion.

111. Benefits are claimed from projects such as Crossrail 2 which are highly unlikely to be delivered within the plan period – if at all.

112. The Southern Rail Access to Heathrow is still in its early stages and would have significant impacts on open space beyond our Borough. For example, all options in the feasibility study would use Staines Moor SSSI and Option 4 would use Bedfont Lakes Country Park (a Local Nature Reserve and SNCI). The various options would use existing commercial, residential and highways land in varying degrees. It seems unlikely that a solution will be delivered within the Plan period and removal of highly valued open space with high biodiversity (wherever it is in South-east England) cannot be regarded as sustainable. So Guildford Borough Council appears to hope to benefit from unsustainable projects elsewhere that will destroy important areas of open space and biodiversity.

113. There is a stark contrast between the plans for the town centre which involve encouraging a reduction in traffic by reducing road space and the plans for the Strategic Road Network and parts of the Local Road Network which involve increasing capacity. While increasing capacity may reduce some areas of congestion in the short term, history suggests that traffic will rapidly grow until the improved roads are congested once again. This can hardly be regarded as sustainable. A sustainable option would be to apply a very substantial traffic infrastructure constraint on the housing number.

114. While the A3 Guildford Tunnel aspiration has some environmental advantages over widening (in particular for residents living close to the A3), the environmental burden of the construction phase is likely to be far higher and aspects such as location of ventilation stacks and their local effect (in all weather conditions) do not appear to have been considered.

115. Under “Weaknesses” the point about A roads in Guildford Town also applies to surrounding areas in the Borough and beyond. The anticipated improvements ignore existing congestion to the south and east of Guildford – presumably because Surrey County Council’s strategic highway assessment methodology has an understated baseline and only identifies the tip of the iceberg. The current Plan will see increased congestion and a resultant reduction in air quality in many areas beyond the town centre.

116. “Largely commercial bus services” is seen as a strength whereas it should be seen as a weakness with a trend to reduced subsidies and the provision of bus services, especially in rural areas, being increasingly dependent on commercial gain. It is difficult to see this changing under the current Government cuts philosophy. The point “Subject to business case including funding” under Aspirations demonstrates this point.

117. Guildford is well behind other areas in monitoring air quality let alone attempting to reduce it. The study talks about reductions in some pollutants. This may be the case for pollutants such as Sulphur Dioxide, which contributed to the visible London smogs, but it is not true of diesel vehicle emissions which have increased as a result of Government policy including its aggressive growth agenda, and population increase through immigration.

118. The study mentions an aspiration to provide 30 accessible electric vehicle charging points but this will be nowhere near enough if there is a real shift to electric vehicles.

119. It is clear from the “Strategy outcomes” that GBC would prefer not to follow other areas in pro-actively tackling air quality.

120. The timescales indicate that the main rail improvements (Including the two new stations) are unlikely to be delivered until the end of the Plan period or even later. The sites that are supposedly justified by their inclusion will generate a major increase in road traffic in the interim and it may be more difficult to achieve this aspect of modal shift in the longer term. The same can be said about the other traffic infrastructure proposals. Residential development is being scheduled before the infrastructure that it will need.
121. Monitoring – “Increase” needs to be in proportion to population growth as otherwise failure will taken as success. “An Increase in average vehicle speeds” is inconsistent with the desire to reduce the number of persons killed or seriously injured. For example, some A roads pass through residential areas where pedestrians, including schoolchildren, are trying to cross the road at peak times. It is noted that increase in vehicle speeds is only desired in the morning. Going home from work does not seem to matter!

Monitoring Indicators for the policy:

122. Ten years is far too long to wait for information on whether the approach is working or not. The target requires only an increase. This would permit an increase less than that in line with any population growth to be regarded as success. The bar has been set well within the failure range given the proposed forced growth in local population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/3185  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Item 4.6.20 makes a statement that is clearly at odds with the actual choice of sites which will generate a major increase in private motor vehicle journeys. For example, the lead Councillor for Planning seems to be alone in believing that a sustainable plan for Wisley Airfield will be found.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16192  Respondent: 8574881 / Melanie McLaren  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5962  Respondent: 8575585 / Ian Macpherson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy 13: Sustainable transport for new developments
Presumably there is some threshold for some at least of the expectations set out in the list. The (legal) drafting of the policy makes the requirements absolute.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7035  **Respondent:** 8575617 / Effingham Parish Council (Ian Symes)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I3 Infrastructure – Sustainable transport for new developments**

Support

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17570  **Respondent:** 8581505 / Burpham Neighbourhood Forum (Jim Allen)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Policy I3: Sustainable transport for New Developments**

As no new road completions are planned for any development until post 2030 – nothing can be considered sustainable, as all roads are currently running above capacity.

This policy also fails to understand that the average travel to work distance is 14 miles to over 50 locations. The only sustainable method to get people to work is push bikes or motorised low capacity transport utilising free running roads.

Road obstructions and little used bus lanes, buses which fail to follow routes required by people travelling to work and journeys with higher per mile costs than a private vehicle are unsustainable. This has been proved in Liverpool where bus lanes have now been removed, reducing pollution and traffic queues.

None of the proposed housing sites are within walking distances, even in good weather, to or from places of employment, shopping or major transport hubs. A walking distance criterion is irrational for normal people’s lives.

The policy is unsound because of the existence of policy I2.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP17/2239  **Respondent:** 8581505 / Burpham Neighbourhood Forum (Jim Allen)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

---
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4.6.21
We recommend the addition of “Adding appropriate planning conditions accordingly to achieve the required goal.”

Subsection 2(d) Deletions have made this meaningless.

4 not definitive subsection 5 too weak needs to refer to Due regard to Neighbourhood plans Car club Not defined
(8) Wording not strong enough Must supply the infrastructure
Add Clause (12) having due regards to compliance with the Neighbourhood Plans

4.6.28
How do we know mitigation will work – the word mitigation implies problems are known to be caused by this proposal and it acknowledges an absolute increase in Traffic yet no guarantees have been put in place and since 2014 proposals which are known to be totally inadequate and unsustainable are being supported by this plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7489  Respondent: 8581633 / Mrs J Cohen  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The town is already congested and transport evidence is not yet fit for use - another river crossing, a central bus facility?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12175  Respondent: 8582017 / The Clandon Society (J Wright)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13511  Respondent: 8582977 / Guildford Environment Forum (John Bannister)  Agent:
Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15531  Respondent: 8585601 / Jennie Kyte  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments

Policy I3 box, 3rd para: The new developments proposed and the proposed building of 13,860 houses will have a simply huge impact on the road system in Guildford Borough, both on major roads, and country roads and lanes.

Major roads, particularly the A3, which cuts through the middle of Guildford, and if widened, will bring more traffic, noise pollution (which is a serious environmental problem in Guildford) and air pollution over the Plan period.

Country lanes are narrow and winding, and cannot be widened without demolishing houses and ruining ancient landscape. Park and Ride parks will not alleviate traffic on country lanes, and will not address the problems mentioned above. It needs to be written into the Local Plan how the impacts of the enormous amount of traffic can be alleviated in such a heavily populated borough as Guildford. Without such assurances based on evidence and careful analysis, traffic must be a constraint on the housing figure for Guildford.

At the same time as when sustainable travel is being promoted, Guildford is to lose its bus station. The bus station is in the heart of the town centre, close to the High St, and serves not only Guildford but the surrounding villages. Buses radiate out from the town in all directions and the bus station is heavily used. Buses also run every 10 minutes to the back entrance of the railway station en route to the hospital or university. No new bus station/exchange is written into the Draft Local Plan.

There appears to be no overall plan to enlarge Guildford railway station and to increase access to it.

A Sustainable Corridor is proposed (para.2, bullet point 8) with land to be reserved, but without further details it is not known how it will work on the narrow parts of the road on the route proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6614</th>
<th>Respondent: 8585697 / Laurence Edwards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locally to Worplesdon the following infrastructure improvements would be required:

- Pedestrian facilities to meet proposed development, including a pedestrian crossing on the A323 near Hunts Farm.
- Improved cycling facilities throughout the parish and improved junctions to have the capacity to cater for existing and future traffic levels.
- I support the upgrade of the pedestrian bridge between the railway station and the town to fully integrate the station with the town.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17260</th>
<th>Respondent: 8585921 / Hampshire County Council (Pete Errington)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that Policy 13 of the Local Plan (Guildford, 2016) places a requirement on any new developments ‘to demonstrate adequate provision to mitigate the likely impacts, including cumulative impacts, of the proposal on both the safe operation and the performance of the Local Road Network and Strategic Road Network’. Hampshire County Council, as a neighbouring Highway Authority would like the to see the wider area incorporated, to include the cross- borough boundary areas such as Hampshire’s road network, within this requirement.

The County Council would expect to be consulted on any future planning applications as and when it is lodged in relation to the developments in Ash and Tongham, in order to identify the potential impact on Hampshire’s Road Network. In addition, it is requested that Hampshire County Council be involved in any discussions aimed at addressing the impacts of any such development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objection to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

I have itemised my objections below but also wish to support some of my points by recalling personal experience and other observations (A-C)

1. **Increased danger to pedestrians should the A247 become busier.** I have medical conditions that require my using a walking stick when out and about. Walking along the stretch of A247 between the Burn Common Roundabout to where it meets the A246 is a fraught experience and requires considerable concentration. In many places the pavements are narrow, uneven and winding; should I stumble I could easily end up in the round. To make matters worse these walkways are not continuous so one often has to cross the busy road and back to reach one’s destination.

2. **Clandon Station is a notoriously dangerous place to exit.** Either on foot or by car, turning right from the main car park onto the A247

3. **Increased congestion on A247 during peaks periods.** While driving during rush hour it can already take 2-3 minutes simply to exit right from Lime Grove onto the A247. Roadworks and accidents cause long –lasting tailbacks as there is no easy way to divert.

I respectfully remind Guildford Borough Council that it has a duty of care to residents and this must be taken into consideration when evaluating the impact of traffic in the area

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15869  **Respondent:** 8586369 / Mr Luigi Fort  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I STRONGLY OBJECT to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). Having lived in West Clandon all my life, I have seen how the local area is already becoming overcrowded. Moreover the A247 is forever becoming a more popular thoroughfare for commuters using the A3 and Woking railway station, coming from Merrow, Gomshall and Horsley, which already has a severe negative impact on those living in the village. The population growth in the surrounding area is evidently already taking its toll on the day-to-day lives of the village people, and I thoroughly believe that to increase it by building almost 14,000 houses will only make matters worse. As a result I consider this Plan unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary. Besides congestion I have many other concerns about it, and herewith set out my objections to specific policies and matters. Please email me an acknowledgement that you have received this correspondence and are dealing with it accordingly.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15880  **Respondent:** 8586369 / Mr Luigi Fort  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15169  Respondent: 8586785 / Elizabeth Critchfield  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Transport

There is no real clarity on transport and road infrastructure. The Plan hints at road improvements but in an ill-defined way. The traffic issues that have dogged Guildford for years are not resolved – there is no commitment to new town bridges, no indication of a central bus exchange, no commitment to consider the viability of a tunnel. Some things that are proposed are unsustainable – the Sustainable Movement Corridors for example. This has all the hall marks of a brainstorming session with Google maps. One site visit would have been enough to realise that the A3100 is not wide enough and has too many pinch points to accommodate four traffic lanes.

The Gosden Hill development is another example of lack of intellectual vigour. Access to it is via a new on-then-off A3 slip road, with the current slip road becoming two way. With all that is proposed for this development, including a 1000 vehicle Park and Ride, and other developments north of Burpham such as Garlick’s Arch and Wisley, thousands more vehicles will be on the roads and many of them will need to access the north bound carriageway of the A3. How do they do this? Drive through Burpham to the Clay Lane north bound slip road. It may look fine and dandy on Google but the reality is somewhat different. Our roads are already congested to the point of grid lock. I live by the present south bound slip and see the traffic come to a halt most days. The SHAR does note that there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham, putting pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout. May I respectfully draw your attention to the fact that there is already a great deal of pressure on that roundabout which alternates between a highways version of bumper cars and complete gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5259  Respondent: 8586817 / Mr J Lawes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
To the new Burnt Common interchange to A3 for 2000 proposed Wisley houses, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, and 1850 houses at Blackwell farm, much of the traffic would go through Send, there would be major traffic problems on every weekday, life in Send would made much worse.

I cannot understand why Send has been singled out for this treatment, our family for one would certainly want to move out of this area to another Greenbelt village elsewhere, where we would hopefully receive better treatment from our authorities. We will be seeking compensation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1551  Respondent: 8587073 / Rushmoor Borough Council (Louise Piper)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (Yes), is Sound? (Yes), is Legally Compliant? (Yes)

The Strategic Highway Assessment report (2016) sets out that in respect of the development proposed in the Local Plan, without any mitigation, the greatest potential impacts are seen on the network in the vicinity of Ash / Ash Vale and travelling north into the borough of Surrey Heath. Some of the trips in Ash / Ash Vale will join the A331 Blackwater Valley Road to travel further afield, but it is likely that a reasonable proportion will travel into the neighbouring boroughs of Rushmoor and Surrey Heath. Some of these roads already experience congestion, despite the model suggesting that existing traffic flows are relatively low.

Policy I1 (Infrastructure and delivery) of the draft Plan requires the infrastructure needed to support development to be provided and available when first needed to serve the occupants and users of the development. Infrastructure includes parks, green spaces and play areas, roads and other transport, schools, flood defences, sporting and recreational facilities, and medical facilities. Policy I3 deals with sustainable transport for new developments, and seeks to ensure that new developments will contribute to the delivery of an integrated, accessible and safe transport system.

Specifically of interest to the strategic allocation around Ash and Tongham, further information on key infrastructure projects is provided at Appendix C of the draft Plan, in the Infrastructure Schedule. Infrastructure projects LRN9 through to LRN14 relate to improvements to traffic management and environmental improvements in and around Ash, Ash Vale and Tongham, to be funded through a combination of developer contributions and Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnership Local Growth Fund awards. For example, the schedule identifies LRN14, which is a junction improvement scheme at the connection of the A331 Blackwater Valley Route with the A31 Hog’s Back (Tongham). It is important to note that this mitigation is required to enable the development proposed in the Local Plan to proceed.

In this context, Rushmoor Borough Council is supportive of the planning policy framework and detailed infrastructure projects as they relate to the road network, subject to certainty regarding the delivery of these improvements as part of the overall package of implementation of development in and around Ash, Ash Vale and Tongham.

As well as Policy I3, Sustainable transport for new developments, the draft Local Plan is also committed to supporting the Department for Transport’s Road Investment Strategy (Policy I2), focusing on improvements to the strategic road network (A3 and M25). The draft Local Plan is supported by the Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2016, which sets out the strategic and local transport infrastructure required to support the development proposed in the Plan.

Rushmoor Borough Council is supportive of the suite of transport policies and proposals identified through the policy framework in the draft Plan and the Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2016. It is likely that the benefits of the implementation of these proposals will be felt not only within Guildford Borough, but also more widely, given the sensitivity of the transport network to individual incidents. For example, Policy A26, the mixed use allocation for Blackwell Farm, off the A31, includes a new link road from the A31, through to Surrey Research Park and the Royal Surrey County Hospital. This will be immensely beneficial in terms of relieving congestion on the A31 into Guildford, as
this will assist with removing the need for traffic travelling from the west of Guildford to drive in and back out using either the A3 trunk road or via the town when seeking to access the Research Park and the Hospital.

However, in the absence of the implementation of the full suite of transport policies and proposals to support the quantum of development set out in the Local Plan, this would potentially result in negative cross boundary transport impacts, the residual cumulative impacts of which would be severe. In this context, the Council looks forward to continuing to work with Guildford Borough Council on potential cross boundary strategic transport issues, to ensure that those arising from development proposed in the Guildford Local Plan are appropriately mitigated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.

2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.

3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.

4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).

5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17183  Respondent: 8591329 / The House of Commons (Anne Milton MP)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Similarly societal trends are also showing an increase in electric cars and smart/electric bikes, development of driverless vehicles and the need for mass transit systems.

Existing train services from Guildford are inadequate. Commuter trains are overcrowded and, at peak hours, unreasonably so. I would welcome the opportunity for a halt at Park Barn, although I have reservations about Merrow. I will continue to lobby the train operators and Network Rail as I have done for many years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/3363  Respondent: 8591329 / The House of Commons (Anne Milton MP)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy ID3 – An imaginative approach to planning for car ownership and use is essential, particularly in town centre locations, and the changes to this policy and supporting text appear to go some way to achieving this.

I would like to see reference to cycling provision (particularly safe storage facilities) strengthened even further. Building car-free development will continue to have an element of aspiration until public and alternative transport is of excellent quality.
17. I object to the impact of further congestion on local village roads and lanes.

18. I object to the impact of excessive development on the A3 and M25 on air quality. The air quality in many parts of the borough is greater than EU permitted levels and will damage the health of residents and future residents.

19. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are designated on Green Belt land along the A3. This will result in gridlock on the A3, the A247 and the surrounding roads which are already at capacity.

The change from 'will expect' to 'will be required' in point (2) is supported. The similar revised wording in point (7) is also supported.

The lack of specificity about the Sustainable Movement Corridor makes it difficult to make an informed comments on point (3). It is very likely that the claims made for the SMC exceed what can be delivered, and the plan should be based on a realistic forecast and a sound business case.

Point (11) is noted but it is not clear that any of the town centre sites included in the plan would involve additional off-street parking.

In para 4.6.28, the aim of achieving 'a modest modal shift' is noted, and also that the road schemes in the plan will 'mitigate the principal adverse material impacts of this growth in traffic volumes'. It is realistic to recognise that there will be congestion on the road network in peak periods. However, the problem is that better evidence is required of what conditions will be like both half way through the plan period and in 2034. The risk of them being unsatisfactory (perhaps unacceptable) is significant.

Para 4.6.24 states the aim and means of implementing the SMC. The sentence beginning 'The Sustainable Movement Corridor will be implemented...' should be revised at the end to read '...provision for the corridor, subject to a sound business case'.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11217</th>
<th>Respondent: 8602337 / Cross Group (Mr Colin Cross)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy I3 - Sustainable Transport for New Developments</td>
<td>I strongly object to any development being built that does not have existing sustainable transport. Blackwell Farm, Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Garlicks Arch do not have such facilities. The former Wisley Airfield is absolutely isolated and can only be accessed by car. Even if a bus service is provided, few will carry shopping, etc., by bus. Walking to Ripley or East Horsley is unrealistic as there are no footpaths, cycle paths or street lighting. (Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill are in the same situation). New developments should take place alongside existing sustainable transport facilities. The Merrow Golf Club, recently proposed for housing, is adjacent to a Park and Ride and new rail links so that is an example of sustainable transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8654</th>
<th>Respondent: 8608225 / Valerie Jenner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With lack of good air quality due to congestion especially in the construction stage, although even now there are problems with the numbers of diesel vehicles especially HGVs, I have concerns about healthy living. (Policy I3) This is a great place to live, but GBC is intent on destroying it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1047</th>
<th>Respondent: 8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBDRA is generally in support of this policy BUT it should include the amendments proposed by Worplesdon Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12579  **Respondent:** 8627009 / East Clandon Parish Council (Sibylla Tindale)  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object that housing being proposed on the Green Belt will increase traffic bringing increased danger and pollution and slower journey times on our already overcrowded village roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9860  **Respondent:** 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13 Sustainable Transport for new developments</th>
<th>Suggest deletion of the final bullet point as this should be included in the CIL 123 Infrastructure list.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullet point 7 should read Travel Plan (in the singular) – see page 149.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp17/2496  **Respondent:** 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

[Comments on 2016 Plan:] Suggest deletion of the final bullet point as this should be included in the CIL 123 Infrastructure list.

Bullet point 7 should read Travel Plan (in the singular) – see page 149.

[Comments on 2017 Plan:] This policy still refers to the P&R site at Gosden Hill. This shows inconsistency between policies.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

[Comments on 2016 Plan:] Suggest deletion of the final bullet point as this should be included in the CIL 123 Infrastructure list.

Bullet point 7 should read Travel Plan (in the singular) – see page 149.

**Attached documents:**
In principle this policy is supported however we would suggest the following additions:

Point 4 In terms of vehicular parking for new developments: (a) in Controlled Parking Zones, or component areas thereof, in which the demand for on-street parking by residents of existing dwellings and, where allowed, ‘pay and display’ visitor parking exceeds the supply of designated on-street parking spaces, planning permission for new residential development resulting in a net increase in dwellings will be subject to a planning obligation to require that future occupants will not be eligible for on-street residents parking permits, with the exception of disabled people who will be eligible (to be secured through the s106 agreement), and (b) for residential new development in all other areas, and for all nonresidential new development in the borough, off-street vehicle parking should be provided such that the level of any resulting parking on the public highway does not adversely impact road safety or the movement of other road users.

Point 8 Planning applications for new development will have regard to the Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C which sets out the key infrastructure requirements on which the delivery of the Plan depends, or any updates in the latest Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan and wherever possible, there is early delivery of such infrastructure to provide early benefit to the Borough.

Point 9 Provision of suitable access and transport infrastructure and services will be achieved through direct improvements and/or schemes funded through Section 278 agreements, Section 106 contributions and/or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), to which will address impacts in the wider area including across the borough boundary.

4.6.24 The Sustainable Movement Corridor will provide a priority pathway through the urban area of Guildford for buses, pedestrians and cyclists, serving the new communities at Blackwell Farm, SARP and Gosden Hill Farm including the new Park and Ride site, the new Guildford West (Park Barn) and Guildford East (Merrow) rail stations, the Onslow Park and Ride, both of the University of Surrey’s campuses, the town centre and Guildford rail station. The aim is for journeys to be rapid and reliable by bus and safe and direct on foot and by bike whilst not having an adverse impact on the existing highway network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I support the concept and aim but OBJECT on the grounds that the practicalities of sustainable transport have not been properly considered, it is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable. Not everyone can cycle all the time.

How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process - the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle – and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?

The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a hoppa bus can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.

While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations there could be unintended consequences.

Detailed response:

Once again we see the word “expect” used which means the policy has no teeth. The word “expect” must be replaced with the word “require” so that this policy is enforceable.

There are a number of problems with this policy.

Congestion is a widely recognised factor in the local area of Guildford, and this is a major factor in the public response to the proposed housing numbers, which represents more than a 25% increase in housing numbers in a borough that is already profoundly congested. [Source: SHMA p61: itself sourced from ONS for 2013.] Residents recognise that to increase the population by this level within the existing transport provision is not feasible, and this informs much of the public response to the proposed level of housing accommodation.

It is not clear that this recognition, which is widespread through the borough, is shared by those who have drafted the Local Plan.

Guildford is a commuter town, which (compared to London) offers better quality of life and lower house prices, so it will continue to be a commuter town for the foreseeable future. As a result, access to the stations for commuting is of significance. It is not realistic to assume that traffic to stations for commuters can be replaced either by bus services (slow, intermittent, expensive, and in many cases absent completely) or by cycle. There is a capacity issue of car parking at the station, which effectively creates an absolute constraint on the feasibility of commuting from Guildford.

Cycling is attractive, and, for the urban young, especially students, it is both practical and cheap, and can be quick. However, as noted, those en route to work cannot be assumed to be able to cycle in working clothes. Elderly members of the community, those transporting small children, and the disabled cannot participate in cycling except to a limited extent. Effectively the "average" person deemed to be capable of cycling to substitute for car trips is an able-bodied adult not travelling to somewhere where smart clothing is required, not needing to arrive clean (or with showering facilities on arrival, not provided by all employers); this is not sufficiently widespread in terms of the local demographic for travellers that it should be allowed to determine policy – and of course, not needing to transport, for example, supermarket shopping after the trip. What about the disabled? the elderly? those looking after more than one child? Are they to be housebound? This is not a reasonable strategy. Before transport and buildings are determined on the basis of such a policy, it is also imperative that safe cycle routes are implemented through the borough. Cycling in winter on rural roads is inherently more dangerous. Upgrading these roads would not be feasible in terms of cost nor desirable in terms of local character.
Cycle lanes which disappear into normal traffic lanes, which travel over potholes and which allow cyclists to be threatened by HGVs are not conducive to wider cycle usage, nor should wider cycle usage be encouraged until it can be demonstrated that it is safe, which currently, locally, it is not. The A25 cycle corridor scheme (Part of LRN1) will exchange the risk between cyclists and vehicles sharing space for the risk between cyclists and pedestrians sharing space. Much of the A25 has no pedestrian area anyway outside the urban space. Many cyclists travel at high speed and they will be put into conflict with pedestrians including mothers with very young children and schoolchildren many of whom need to cross the road and hence cross the cycleway. This is likely to lead to accidents and pedestrians are being disadvantaged.

Road capacity reduces as average speeds come down due to congestion. Where proper cycle lanes or off-road lanes are not provided then it is inevitable that safe driving will lead to reduced average motor vehicle speeds and gap development in the traffic stream. Both these effects act to reduce the capacity of our local road network. This loss of capacity has not been recognised in the Transport Strategy.

The concept of the park and ride with access into the town limited for those who live outside the town, is similarly flawed. Park and Ride is expensive, cumbersome and slow. It should be noted that in Oxford it has had a disastrous impact on small local retailers which is a retail segment that it is important to retain and support.

Use of park and rides increases the use of the strategic road network by local users, which is not what it is designed to do.

This proposal is combined with aggressive exclusion from the town of those who are living in peripheral communities, which will increasingly resemble housing estates. This is a strategy for sink estates through Surrey instead of the Green Belt - this is not a strategy for growth. Head offices will choose to go elsewhere, because highly skilled staff and management in the cutting edge industries that GBC wants to encourage, will not choose to live in a dense housing estate.

The existing extent of traffic congestion has not been fully recognised. As a consequence the impact of the various development scenarios has been understated and the infrastructure costs are an understatement.

The transport studies are incomplete and unpublished and this should have led to deferral of consideration of the Local Plan consultation process until it was possible to revise the plan post publication of the studies. This matter was raised by a number of councillors at the Full Council meeting on 24 May 2016 when the consultation was approved, but a motion to defer was overturned by the majority party.

Cross-subsidy in terms of infrastructure is envisaged. The infrastructure deficit needs to be resolved before there are large numbers of new residents exacerbating the current congestion. The funding of the new developments through CIL and S 106 is expected to contribute to the transport impacts across the borough, and there is negligible concern for the transport problems created within those new developments or in areas adjacent to them. This is not acceptable to existing residents and is likely to cause some problems with the future residents too, who may arguably feel aggrieved that the road funding associated with their developments is being subverted to other areas. While this may be permissible under the revised CIL regulations it is questionable whether it is morally acceptable to grant planning permission to build on the Green Belt in order to cross subsidise the building of roads or other infrastructure in the town centre or elsewhere across the borough or outside it.

Insetting of villages and the proposed relaxation of planning restrictions anywhere outside settlements (Green Belt or not), implied in P2, will lead to substantial infilling that will not require traffic assessment but will contribute a highly significant amount of additional car journeys overall - by a more insidious process than the large developments proposed.

Costs for rail or bus travel could be substantially reduced and would incentivise their use; but these are outside the remit of GBC and so cannot be encouraged by them.

It remains to be seen whether the proposed new stations will be delivered as they are not entirely within the council’s control. While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations there could be unintended
consequences as the roads local to both sites are heavily congested. If parking facilities are inadequate this could lead to a need for onerous parking restrictions on roads nearby – possibly affecting small businesses adversely.

If parking facilities are adequate this will encourage more traffic onto local roads and commuters tend to be hurrying to catch a train or anxious to return home after a day at work. That does not bode well for the safety of pedestrians needing to cross those roads. House prices near to stations tend to attract higher prices and this will increase the profit motive to developers wanting to build on greenfield sites nearby. It will also mean that so-called affordable housing will be even less affordable at these sites. It may also lead, over time, to an undesirable loss of social-rented housing in the vicinity. A minor issue is that stopping at the additional stations will increase the train journey times to and from Guildford town centre on the lines affected.

**Detail in Policy wording – flawed drafting:**

The policy begins and ends with the weak and totally ineffective word, in planning terms, “expect”.

Contributing through CIL will not necessarily address needs local to the development concerned, and created by it, but may involve solving existing problems elsewhere in the Borough.

Bullets 4 & 5 – improvements to park and ride facilities imply increased car usage from outside the town and the parking provision acknowledges that most journeys will be by car.

Bullet 6 - Has the Vehicle parking Supplementary Planning Document been published? It is not listed as key evidence but the policy refers. How can a policy have been determined with reference to a non-existent part of the evidence base?

Bullets 7, 8, 9 & 10 are weak & aspirational with let-out words such as “facilitate the use of”, “wherever possible”, “contribute” and “where appropriate” (and poorly bulleted!). How will the use of ultra low emission vehicles be facilitated? This is such a vague aspiration as to be meaningless.

The policy only “expects” new developments to contribute, demonstrate adequate provision, etc – it should enforce them. A transport statement AND assessment ought to be a fixed requirement – not a matter for negotiation – while the policy implies that this might be waived even for sites that generate significant amounts of movement.

The construction traffic, noise and pollution generated by meeting the proposed housing number will be excessive. It will have a highly significant impact on the amenity and health of those residents living close to the development sites and those who live on the routes that will be taken by the construction traffic.

The last paragraph says nothing new in planning terms but does mean that the Local Plan has not fully and properly considered the traffic impacts of the proposed sites. We have experience of how misleading the TAs produced by developers can be – using averaging techniques and understated baseline figures, days when schools are not operating and many other devices to pull the wool over the eyes of planning authorities. This aspect is a denial of responsibility by GBC. The result is that Green Belt and countryside will be released for development when fuller consideration of traffic impacts at the Local Plan stage should have prevented that. If the planning authority is taken in by developers’ TAs then wholly unsuitable developments will be permitted.

**Introduction:**

The spatial development strategy (paragraph 4.6.20 and Policy S2) does not address the development needs of the borough ensuring distances are practical; this is certainly not the case with all the development sites. For example, the Wisley airfield site will generate a massive increase in vehicle journeys; developments in West Horsley will lead to greater car use, as will the proposed developments at Garlick’s Arch and in Send. The obvious site choice for sustainable development would be on brownfield sites in the town but the Local Plan proposes allocating those sites to the declining retail industry instead.

Paragraph 4.6.21 suggests that sustainable transport is promoted. Far from providing sustainable transport this Plan will generate a massive increase in motor vehicle journeys. The Plan cannot force residents to ride bicycles or walk everywhere.
Paragraph 4.6.22 seeks to set out a reasoned justification and alleges that development should offer real travel choice by sustainable transport modes. There is little sign that this is being taken seriously enough now.

Paragraph 4.6.23 proposed to bring forward a Vehicle Parking Supplementary Planning Document. It is not clear what to make of this. Failure to provide off-street vehicle parking will not prevent residents owning cars and finding somewhere else to park but it may make life difficult for key workers to commute to their place of work. How can a consultation take place relying on non-existent background documents which are key parts of the Evidence Base? How can anyone comment on non-existent documents, and even if brought forward part-way through the consultation, any comments will be prejudiced by the absence of this informing the start of the consultation.

Paragraph 4.6.24 refers to the Sustainable Movement Corridor. Bus services are aspirational but economic reality may mean that they fail to persist. There is not enough detail published on how the SMC will be delivered – suggesting that it is aspirational rather than fully thought through.

Paragraph 4.6.26 refers to reviewing existing transport facilities and likely transport generation as part of assessing the amount of incremental travel demand. That consideration should have taken place in a robust and detailed manner on a site-by-site basis before the sites were allocated in the Local Plan. It is not sufficient to leave that until the planning application stage as intended by GBC and SCC, given that all sites will be subject to “permission in principle” under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and so will not be capable of subsequent rejection on these grounds.

Paragraph 4.6.27 notes that Development must mitigate its transport impacts. The measures described rely entirely on people taking them up and not dumping their travel information packs in the nearest bin. It is clear that GBC, in response to concerns about elderly and disabled people failing to be coerced into riding bicycles are now suggesting tricycles to overcome this obstacle to their aspirations. They should be aware that while tricycles may help with balance issues they are heavier and harder to ride uphill. While the policy (unusually) notes that mitigation must be provided, in fact this is then diluted to suggest that facilities for electric car charging points and encouragement to car-share can be sufficient; all are optional and therefore meaningless.

However well designed a development is it will make matters worse during construction and if on a greenfield site, it is hard to see how it will achieve environmental benefits. On the other hand, replacing inefficient buildings on a brownfield site could lead to benefits in the long term.

Paragraph 4.6.28 notes “Developers should have regard” to the “Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C”. The only thing that developers have regard for is forcing their application through and maximising their profit – that is the business they are in. Appendix C is lacking in detail. It notes, for example that there will be new town centre bus facilities at a cost of £5-10 million – such vagueness make it clear that no real costing or analysis of proposals has been prepared, and that the Infrastructure improvements proposed have not been properly considered. Having regard to fluid and uncertain proposals is effectively meaningless as a constraint or a requirement.

Paragraph 4.6.29 requires that applications need to address the transport implications of the proposed development. Experience with recent planning applications suggests that developers will do everything in their power to understate transport impacts and we have no faith in GBC and SCC taking a sufficiently robust line on this.

Key Evidence is missing or inadequate.

The Strategic Transport Assessment (SCC 2016) is listed as “forthcoming”, but this plan has been produced in the absence of any strategic transport review.

There are further inadequacies in the Evidence Base, highlighted in the following annexes, which include examples of deficiencies, ambiguities and inadequacies in the transport and infrastructure evidence. This is not a comprehensive list of deficiencies, but serves as an illustration of the poor evidence on which decisions have been based.

Annexe 1
Comments on Guildford Borough Transport Study 2016

Page 2 – “address the historic infrastructure deficit” - developers are not required to do this?

Page 2 – It is wrong to claim that the cycle infrastructure along the A25 is good – and many cyclists are not careful, so putting them in contention with pedestrians is not a good idea.

Page 5 – The decision on Heathrow or Gatwick has yet to be taken but airport expansion in the south-east cannot be regarded as sustainable development and, although GBC has no control over such external decisions, its own growth agenda will drive a need for that expansion.

Page 6 An additional weakness is alternative “road closure diversion” routes for the SRN on the LRN

Page 6 Are the “Committed Improvements” actually committed and guaranteed to be delivered?

Page 7 The rail strategy does not provide for Wisley (residents would drive to stations)

Page 7 How long will it take to deliver Crossrail 2? “We hope that Crossrail 2 could be operational by 2030, but we are in the very early stages of planning and no decision to build it has been made.”

Page 7 Guildford platform capacity still many years away if ever.

Page 7 The rail strategy anticipates many improvements that have not been secured and may have unintended consequences if they proceed (see above)

Page 7 The Southern Rail Access to Heathrow ##[see the feasibility study dated December 2015 – although other proposals may be put forward (e.g. by Hounslow)]## is still in its early stages and would have significant impacts on open space beyond our Borough. For example, all options in the feasibility study would use Staines Moor SSSI and Option 4 would use Bedfont Lakes Country Park (a Local Nature Reserve and SNCI).

The various options would use existing commercial, residential and highways land in varying degrees. It seems unlikely that a solution will be delivered within the Plan period and removal of highly valued open space with high biodiversity (wherever it is in South-east England) cannot be regarded as sustainable.

Page 10 and 13 There is a stark contrast between the plans for the town centre which involve encouraging a reduction in traffic by reducing roadspace and the plans for the SRN and parts of the LRN which involve increasing capacity. While increasing capacity may reduce some areas of congestion in the short term, history suggests that traffic will rapidly grow until the improved roads are congested once again. This can hardly be regarded as sustainable. A sustainable option would be to apply a very substantial traffic infrastructure constraint on the housing number.

Page 10 While the A3 Guildford Tunnel aspiration has some environmental advantages over widening (in particular for residents living close to the A3), the environmental burden of the construction phase will be far higher and aspects such as location of ventilation stacks and their local effect (in all weather conditions) do not appear to have been considered.

Page 14 Under Weaknesses the point about A roads in Guildford Town also applies to surrounding areas in the Borough and beyond. The anticipated improvements ignore existing congestion to the south and east of Guildford – presumably because SCC’s transport assessment methodology only identifies the tip of the iceberg. The current Plan will see increased congestion and a resultant reduction in air quality in many areas beyond the town centre.

Page 16 “Largely commercial bus services” is seen as a strength whereas it should be seen as a weakness with a trend to reduced subsidies and the provision of bus services, especially in rural areas, being increasingly dependent on commercial gain. It is difficult to see this changing under the current Government cuts philosophy. The point “Subject to business case including funding” under Aspirations demonstrates this point.

Page 18 We welcome the aspiration to “Expand the public realm through significantly extended pedestrian-priority areas”
Guildford is well behind other areas in monitoring air quality let alone attempting to reduce it.

The introduction talks about reductions in some pollutants. This may be the case for pollutants such as Sulphur Dioxide, which contributed to the visible London smogs, but it is not true of diesel vehicle emissions which have increased as a result of Government policy including its aggressive growth agenda and population increase through immigration.

30 accessible electric vehicle charging points are only an aspiration and will be nowhere near enough if there is a real shift to electric vehicles.

It is clear from the “Strategy outcomes” that GBC would prefer not to follow other areas in pro-actively tackling air quality.

Page 22/23/24 The timescales indicate that the main rail improvements (Including the two new stations) are unlikely to be delivered until the end of the Plan period or even later. The sites that are supposedly justified by their inclusion will generate a major increase in road traffic in the interim and it may be more difficult to achieve this aspect of modal shift in the longer term. The same can be said about the other traffic infrastructure proposals. Residential development is being scheduled before the infrastructure that it will need.

Page 24 Monitoring – “Increase” needs to be in proportion to population growth as otherwise failure will taken as success. “An Increase in average vehicle speeds” is inconsistent with the desire to reduce the number of persons killed or seriously injured. For example, some A roads pass through residential areas where pedestrians, including schoolchildren, are trying to cross the road at peak times. It is noted that increase in vehicle speeds is only desired in the morning. Going home from work does not seem to matter!

Annexe 2

GTAMS

NPPF and NPPG The Plan ignores the points concerning Green Belt and protecting the environment. GBC have tried to get round this by spinning their messages and using misleading statistics including a major understatement of the area of Green Belt to be removed.

Planning Update (March 2015) – The point in this update concerning Green Belt has been ignored

Monitoring Indicators:

Ten years is far too long to wait for information on whether the approach is working or not. The target requires only an increase. This would permit an increase less than that in line with any population growth to be regarded as success. The bar has been set well within the failure range.

Policy 14: Green and blue infrastructure

Response

Summary

Response type: OBJECT

The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which is welcome. We also note and welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. However the current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will have the opposite effect. The Policy appears therefore to be a box-ticking exercise with no real teeth to it.
There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

“The natural world, its biodiversity and its constituent ecosystems are critically important to our wellbeing and economic prosperity, but are consistently undervalued in conventional economic analyses and decision-making” (Biodiversity 2020 page 11)

“As a public authority in England you have a duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of your policy or decision making.” (Government Planning Guidance)

Part of the problem is that “Biodiversity benefits are unpriced” and so not valued by those who look only at the more obvious and simplistic economic benefits.

We have some concerns that “enhancing” the River Wey in the town centre will avoid using the available brownfield land around Walnut Tree Close and Slyfield for urban regeneration and sustainable housing that could otherwise be used.

Why should the Walnut Tree Close/Woodbridge Meadows industrial area not be regenerated from bus garages, urban car parks and empty factories to offer sustainable, well designed, urban homes which are medium height, and can meet almost all of Guildford’s real housing needs?

**Detailed response:**

The policy on Green and Blue infrastructure is broadly supported with an important and major caveat; and if disregarded this should count as an objection.

However, it is noted that the largest areas of industrial brownfield land within the borough are near to or adjacent to the River Wey, particularly in the Walnut Tree Close area and in the Slyfield industrial area.

These areas could support much more housing than the relatively small numbers indicated in the policy on the town centre, under a town centre regeneration scheme. This would have huge benefits for the community as a whole since relatively run down areas would be subject to regeneration, the river banks would be cleaner and more attractive.

It is vitally important for the town as a whole that the run-down Walnut Tree Close area is used for well-designed housing, as indicated by the Mastervision document first draft compiled by Allies and Morrison. John Rigg of Savills and Guildford Vision Group indicated to the Scrutiny Committee of GBC that initial commercial projections indicated that the Walnut Tree Close area alone could provide 4000 homes. This is significantly in excess of the current GBC proposals. Both Allies & Morrison and GVG initially indicated that they believed that this site could be available for regeneration within the critical 5 year window required for the local plan. It is therefore essential that nothing in this policy should jeopardise anything that could lead to the Walnut Tree Close area being a regeneration zone.

As has been noted elsewhere, for reasons that are not altogether clear but appear to be connected to central government direction and a desire to maximize the Community Infrastructure Levy, there is an aggressive desire to push development on to the Green Belt at all costs, ignoring or eliminating for other reasons sites which could be used in the town for residential purposes. This has informed recent planning decisions (both the Aldi site and the Waitrose site were originally zoned for residential purposes and were eminently suitable for this) and this bias seems to be informing the Local Plan.

As a result, it is important that the desire for Green and Blue infrastructure does not become an excuse for preventing regeneration of Walnut Tree Close. It is noted that the Council has stated that “The Council is keen to protect the watercourses from inappropriate development that would spoil their character”. The bus station adjacent to the River Wey, and the empty car parks associated with empty factory space, are hardly attractive development – well designed mid height (3-4 storey) apartment blocks would be a great improvement to the river corridor, offer major scope for
sustainable regeneration, and would prevent the need for any incursion into the Green Belt to meet reasonable housing needs.

That regeneration zone would be highly sustainable, because it would be within 1 mile of the railway station, adjacent to the A3, and would eliminate an area of huge congestion in the town because if the industrial sites were replaced by housing then the residents would commute by train or walk to work rather than having to drive in to an industrial estate.

It certainly does not seem appropriate to create substantial new parkland on current hard standing. The protections to which this policy refers largely describe existing open space, which is of great importance. But to determine not to utilize brownfield land for residential use at an appropriate density in order to force building on to the Green Belt would seem to be in contradiction of the principles of use of the Green Belt applied in the Gallaher Homes v Solihull court of appeal case, where the hierarchy of use is clearly defined, with urban brownfield required to be used as a first option.

So there is some considerable support for the residential element of this policy, with the note that this should be explicitly amended to permit construction of a regeneration zone on the brownfield areas surrounding the river in the middle of the town, and that this should not be held up pending yet more transport studies (Guildford’s track record on brownfield utilisation is poor), but should be implemented with immediate effect.

It is not clear what form the “parkland” along the River Wey will take but the images available in the Town Centre MasterPlan suggest mown grass similar to the area around Millmead. This misses an opportunity to enhance biodiversity and enable town centre residents to engage with wildlife. Engagement with wildlife should mean much more than throwing bread at ducks and chasing pigeons. To achieve a wildlife corridor through Guildford, that can also benefit the health and well-being of residents living close by, the green space retained beside the river should be managed with the needs of wildlife in mind.

**Responses to policy notes:**

4.6.33 Villages are generally permeable to wildlife. The lower density of housing and presence of gardens (especially larger gardens) provides a corridor for movement across the residential area. Insetting of villages and the relaxation of planning restrictions in the Green Belt implied by Policy P2 will lead to infilling, “garden grabbing” and consequent loss of biodiversity. It will replace connections and corridors between habitats with barriers and lead to further fragmentation of our natural infrastructure.

4.6.34 In the past Guildford Borough Council recognised the role that wildlife gardening and management of parks and open spaces for wildlife could play in enhancing biodiversity. There seems to have been a shift away from this. These aspects should be recognised in the Plan as well as the importance of BOAs and although 4.6.35 goes part way towards this we have yet to see the GISPD.

4.6.36 This is long overdue and should include the way that our lanes are managed. The current approach is unsympathetic, sometimes damaging tree roots and scarce native plants. It seems to be oriented towards encouraging faster traffic rather than recognising the traffic-calming effects of natural vegetation (See the original Quiet Lanes Initiative) – management of open spaces and lanes

We await the Countryside Vision with interest.

4.6.37 It appears that Policy I5 (whatever it was) has been omitted. (We think this means P5 – more evidence of slapdash work)

4.6.38 I agree with this statement but public access is frequently damaging to biodiversity – the more obvious examples being dogs out of control in the vicinity of ground-nesting birds and trampling of grassland habitats. Public open space must be protected for the reasons given but wildlife needs undisturbed (or at least less disturbed) space too if it is to thrive.

**Responses to definitions:**
This section starts with a definition that is not a proper definition and is followed by statements that are not definitions at all, apart from the last – suggesting that this part of the document has not been thought through or checked.

4.6.42 “Biodiversity creation and/or enhancement” is not a definition – it requires definition.

Do you mean that you will create new species or encourage them to evolve? Or do you mean that you will increase the number of species living in the Borough, or the population of each species, or both?

The points made are aspirational that have no enforcement to back them.

We support the use of green roofs and walls.

However, building on the countryside and increasing the population by such a large amount will not help vulnerable species. It will put added pressure on remaining habitats and increase light and air pollution, degrading the ability of the borough to support wildlife.

4.6.43 Arrangements with developers have no guarantee of success or longevity. They involve partial mitigation and overall loss of the original biodiversity interest of a site.

4.6.44 This appears to be saying that you will deliberately put playing fields, sports facilities and other leisure activities in BOAs – but these are land uses that reduce biodiversity!

4.6.45 Our understanding of SANG is that it is intended to reduce pressure on Special Protection Areas by providing an alternative area for people to walk their dogs – and hope that they do not prefer to use the SPA. In other words they are intended to attract the type of user that is damaging to vulnerable species such as ground-nesting birds. In the desperation to find SANG land Guildford Borough Council are making use of existing open space that will not attract people away from the SPA and you are ignoring the impact on existing wildlife. For example – GBC decided to include the towpath in the Parsonage Meadows SANG as a way of also facilitating a cycle route. Encouraging cyclists and dog-walkers to use the same narrow path will not encourage dog-walkers to use it rather than the SPA. At Effingham Common GBC plan to designate an important area for wildlife and ground-nesting Skylarks. GBC is riding roughshod over the opinions of the Commoners and local residents. GBC used to put up signage warning dog-walkers not to disturb the Skylarks during the nesting season – but it appears that these signs are no longer there. Protests to Cllr Richard Billington may result in returning signs but these are not yet in place.

In allocating sites as SANG, GBC has ignored the requirement to consider existing biodiversity and clearly have little or any knowledge or understanding of the issue. The issues relating to Russell Place Farm have been pointed out by a qualified Biologist (see article in The Guildford Dragon – Chris Venables), Many invertebrates are dependent on the dung of grazing animals and this aspect of our countryside is being steadily driven out of our Borough.

4.6.46 We welcome this acknowledgement of the damaging effects of the proposed building developments. This also has relevance to the manner in which the green spaces next to the River Wey are managed.

4.6.47 We welcome the proposals but are concerned that these may be no more than good intentions. How will GBC ensure that they are carried out fully – and paid for by the developer?

**Reasoned Justification:**

4.6.50 As the emerging strategy for Surrey and the GISPD are not yet available the plan should not be proposing sites that will jeopardise them. The implication is that this aspect of the plan is not being taken seriously and will carry no weight in site selection despite the guidance in the NPPF.

4.6.51 In fact some GBC contract mowing and lane management is not in line with a strategy that is meant to protect biodiversity. (Examples – damage to tree roots and unsympathetic treatment of roadside vegetation (that includes orchid species) in Chalk Lane – southern end of Kingston Meadow in East Horsley is now mown flat rather than left to grow as a meadow through the Spring and Summer as it used to be (so no more day-flying Burnet moths there for example.)
KEY EVIDENCE

Guildford Borough Policy Statements are statements – not evidence.

Additional evidence should include:

Existing SNCI surveys, including those that took place in 2004-2007.

Biodiversity evidence emerging from Neighbourhood Plans.

Evidence obtained by requests to local naturalists and natural history societies including those with a specialist interest.

MONITORING

Simply maintaining open space will not be enough for a significantly enlarged population.

Providing more open space to meet existing shortfalls or the needs of a much larger population will reduce the area of land currently in food production or providing wildlife habitat.

SANG delivery is harming existing biodiversity

It is not clear how you will measure a change in biodiversity just by looking at planning applications. “Net gains in biodiversity provided by development” is a contradiction in terms. There may well be a few examples in England where low density housing has been combined with manufactured habitat at the expense of loss of agricultural land with no surrounding habitat damage - but we see no evidence of that in the Local Plan. Even when a housing development replaces agricultural land it increases pressure on the surrounding countryside. A simple example is where houses border woodland and residents dump their garden rubbish (and often worse) over the garden fence. Increased leisure use on nearby countryside also has an adverse effect on biodiversity.

There is no guarantee that mitigations listed in an application will be carried out and their effectiveness is not guaranteed either. GBC would need to carry out follow-up ecological surveys on all sites. Who would pay for these? Are there enough consultants to carry out the work in sufficient detail? What aspects of biodiversity will be measured?

How frequently are surveys by Natural England intended to take place? How will GBC ensure that NE carry them out? A baseline of existing surveys against which changes will be monitored should be included within the plan and it must be comprehensive for monitoring to be effective.

How frequently will SNCI surveys be carried out? At what expense? The last survey published in 2007 made recommendations for an increase in the size of the Wisley Airfield SNCI and stated that this should be taken into account for planning purposes. This was overridden in the recent planning inspector’s report and the Local Plan includes this particular SNCI as a building site. This is clearly a case of hypocrisy and suggests that the Council has no genuine intention to maintain biodiversity let alone enhance it.

We believe that a survey of SNCIs is currently taking place but that it is limited in scope to the previously known sites. This prevents other sites, where genuine biodiversity enhancement has taken place (often as a result of volunteer community effort), from being recognised in this way. While every stone is being turned over in the quest to find green space to build on, no genuine effort is being made to identify biodiversity hotspots that may have been overlooked in the past. In other words the approach being taken is one that intends to make no net gain, and possibly even reduce, sites of nature conservation interest – in contradiction to the stated aims.

If an existing SNCI (or one proposed on grounds of biodiversity but not formally accepted in a Local Plan) is found to be in poor condition the action taken should be to bring it back into good condition – not to remove its status and build on it.

Policy P3: Countryside.
**Response**

**Summary**

I OBJECT to this policy as it stands. There is huge emphasis on provision both of services and of additional Green Belt in Ash and Tongham. It is not clear why new Green Belt should be designated here, while the Green Belt is being rolled back in all other areas of the borough. The only notable fact is that the Leader of the Council and other Executive members are based in this area and the question of impartiality does need to be raised.

**Detailed response**

Note that in the recent judicial review in relation to Ashdown Forest, the SANG zone for the Ashdown Forest SPA was 7km, and this gave rise to a lower housing number than that proposed by this local authority.

The urban areas of Ash and Tongham are indeed of importance within the borough, creating a barrier between the countryside of Guildford and the urban towns of Aldershot and Farnborough.

However, as noted, it does not seem entirely appropriate to seek to reduce Green Belt designation everywhere else in the borough, on the grounds of overwhelming housing need (which is itself not an exceptional circumstance) – including land within the Green Belt and the Thames Basin Heath SPA, but then to propose designating additional Green Belt in this particular area.

If the planning policy is sufficiently aggressive as to disregard existing Green Belt, to propose significant development in that area, then it is inappropriate, and in contravention of existing planning law, (Gallagher Homes v Solihull as determined by the Court of Appeal) to consider proposing new areas for Green Belt. It is unclear why the strategic gap that separates the Ash and Tongham urban areas from neighbouring Aldershot is of greater significance to the borough as a whole, than other threatened Green Belt villages and fields.

The desire to protect the strategic gap between Ash and Tongham and Ash Green is welcomed, and provided that this does not arise because of a loss of Green Belt land elsewhere, the proposal to include some of this land within the Green Belt is welcomed too. However, Green Belt boundaries should not be traded off. One village community should not benefit to the detriment of another. The proposed extension of Green Belt designation to Ash and Tongham is unlikely to succeed, because it is not inherently better at serving the purposes of the Green Belt than other areas threatened by development, and a similar attempt in Solihull was wholly unsuccessful. The Court of Appeal decision will represent a precedent in this regard.

As noted in Gallagher Homes v Solihull, the NPPF is based on PPG2 which is quoted in a similar context to this proposal:

“If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt.”

In other words, before altering Green Belt boundaries (to use for building), land beyond the Green Belt should be considered as building land first; and first of all, brownfield urban land should be used. Provided that the Green Belt is not subject to the wholesale assault then this extension might be acceptable to the wider community within the borough. It will not be acceptable as a trade-off for loss of the Green Belt elsewhere.

Policy P3 States that ‘development will only be permitted permitted provided it:

“requires a countryside location or where a rural location can be justified, and is proportionate to the nature and scale of the site, its setting and countryside location, and does not lead to greater physical or visual coalescence between the Ash and Tongham urban area and Aldershot”.
We would like to know what the rural justification of proposed housing has for Ash and Tongham and how Guildford Borough Council proves that contributes to the rural economy? In the Local Plan, Guildford Borough Council refers to these Eastern Borough proposals as ‘extensions to urban boundaries’. Developments of 1241 and 91 homes cannot possibly meet the necessary term ‘rural justification’ (The site allocation maps show different figures of 1200, 62, 58 homes)

As far as we can tell with the corresponding maps, the proposed developments in Ash and Tongham will create a greater coalescence between the separate villages to combine them into one urban area with a slither of green space between it and the A331/Aldershot.

Designation of Green Belt does not guarantee a barrier between Ash and Ash Green as Guildford has demonstrated the urge to move the Green Belt boundaries in communities elsewhere. We would suggest removing the allocation of further Green Belt designation as it does not follow NPPG Policy. There are no exceptional circumstances to allow changes in Green Belt Boundaries in Guildford.

It is also not clear what the impact will be of designating SANG in this area, and whether this will be used to permit building on Green Belt or land otherwise protected because of the Thames Basin Heath SPA designation elsewhere.

Ash and Tongham have countryside designated Ancient Woodland, AGLV and SNCI and a sensitive historic site which must be protected. This, together with a focus on using existing brownfield within the urban settlement area and a more realistic housing number, should succeed in protecting the valuable countryside around Ash and Tongham, while the attempt to adjust Green Belt boundaries seems doomed to failure and therefore will allow wholesale overdevelopment in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10097  Respondent: 8640353 / Julian Cranwell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments
This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

We support the concept and aim but OBJECT on the grounds that the practicalities of sustainable transport have not been properly considered, it is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable. Not everyone can cycle all the time.

How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process - the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle – and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?
The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a hoppa bus can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle. While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations there could be unintended consequences. Once again we see the word “expect” used which means the policy has no teeth. The word “expect” must be replaced with the word “require” so that this policy is enforceable.

There are a number of problems with this policy.

Congestion is a widely recognised factor in the local area of Guildford, and this is a major factor in the public response to the proposed housing numbers, which represents more than a 25% increase in housing numbers in a borough that is already profoundly congested. [Source: SHMA p61: itself sourced from ONS for 2013.] Residents recognise that to increase the population by this level within the existing transport provision is not feasible, and this informs much of the public response to the proposed level of housing accommodation.

It is not clear that this recognition, which is widespread through the borough, is shared by those who have drafted the Local Plan.

Guildford is a commuter town, which (compared to London) offers better quality of life and lower house prices, so it will continue to be a commuter town for the foreseeable future. As a result, access to the stations for commuting is of significance. It is not realistic to assume that traffic to stations for commuters can be replaced either by bus services (slow, intermittent, expensive, and in many cases absent completely) or by cycle. There is a capacity issue of car parking at the station, which effectively creates an absolute constraint on the feasibility of commuting from Guildford.

Cycling is attractive, and, for the urban young, especially students, it is both practical and cheap, and can be quick. However, as noted, those en route to work cannot be assumed to be able to cycle in working clothes. Elderly members of the community, those transporting small children, and the disabled cannot participate in cycling except to a limited extent. Effectively the “average” person deemed to be capable of cycling to substitute for car trips is an able-bodied adult not travelling to somewhere where smart clothing is required, not needing to arrive clean (or with showering facilities on arrival, not provided by all employers); this is not sufficiently widespread in terms of the local demographic for travellers that it should be allowed to determine policy – and of course, not needing to transport, for example, supermarket shopping after the trip. What about the disabled? the elderly? those looking after more than one child? Are they to be housebound? This is not a reasonable strategy. Before transport and buildings are determined on the basis of such a policy, it is also imperative that safe cycle routes are implemented through the borough. Cycling in winter on rural roads is inherently more dangerous. Upgrading these roads would not be feasible in terms of cost nor desirable in terms of local character.

Cycle lanes which disappear into normal traffic lanes, which travel over potholes and which allow cyclists to be threatened by HGVs are not conducive to wider cycle usage, nor should wider cycle usage be encouraged until it can be demonstrated that it is safe, which currently, locally, it is not. The A25 cycle corridor scheme (Part of LRN1) will exchange the risk between cyclists and vehicles sharing space for the risk between cyclists and pedestrians sharing space. Much of the A25 has no pedestrian area anyway outside the urban space. Many cyclists travel at high speed and they will be put into conflict with pedestrians including mothers with very young children and schoolchildren many of whom need to cross the road and hence cross the cycleway. This is likely to lead to accidents and pedestrians are being disadvantaged.

Road capacity reduces as average speeds come down due to congestion. Where proper cycle lanes or off-road lanes are not provided then it is inevitable that safe driving will lead to reduced average motor vehicle speeds and gap development in the traffic stream. Both these effects act to reduce the capacity of our local road network. This loss of capacity has not been recognised in the Transport Strategy.

The concept of the park and ride with access into the town limited for those who live outside the town, is similarly flawed. Park and Ride is expensive, cumbersome and slow. It should be noted that in Oxford it has had a disastrous impact on small local retailers which is a retail segment that it is important to retain and support.

Use of park and rides increases the use of the strategic road network by local users, which is not what it is designed to do.
This proposal is combined with aggressive exclusion from the town of those who are living in peripheral communities, which will increasingly resemble housing estates. This is a strategy for sink estates through Surrey instead of the Green Belt - this is not a strategy for growth. Head offices will choose to go elsewhere, because highly skilled staff and management in the cutting edge industries that GBC wants to encourage, will not choose to live in a dense housing estate.

The existing extent of traffic congestion has not been fully recognised. As a consequence the impact of the various development scenarios has been understated and the infrastructure costs are an understatement.

The transport studies are incomplete and unpublished and this should have led to deferral of consideration of the Local Plan consultation process until it was possible to revise the plan post publication of the studies. This matter was raised by a number of councillors at the Full Council meeting on 24 May 2016 when the consultation was approved, but a motion to defer was overturned by the majority party.

Cross-subsidy in terms of infrastructure is envisaged. The infrastructure deficit needs to be resolved before there are large numbers of new residents exacerbating the current congestion. The funding of the new developments through CIL and S 106 is expected to contribute to the transport impacts across the borough, and there is negligible concern for the transport problems created within those new developments or in areas adjacent to them. This is not acceptable to existing residents and is likely to cause some problems with the future residents too, who may arguably feel aggrieved that the road funding associated with their developments is being subverted to other areas. While this may be permissible under the revised CIL regulations it is questionable whether it is morally acceptable to grant planning permission to build on the Green Belt in order to cross subsidise the building of roads or other infrastructure in the town centre or elsewhere across the borough or outside it.

Insetting of villages and the proposed relaxation of planning restrictions anywhere outside settlements (Green Belt or not), implied in P2, will lead to substantial infilling that will not require traffic assessment but will contribute a highly significant amount of additional car journeys overall - by a more insidious process than the large developments proposed.

Costs for rail or bus travel could be substantially reduced and would incentivise their use; but these are outside the remit of GBC and so cannot be encouraged by them.

It remains to be seen whether the proposed new stations will be delivered as they are not entirely within the council’s control. While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations there could be unintended consequences as the roads local to both sites are heavily congested. If parking facilities are inadequate this could lead to a need for onerous parking restrictions on roads nearby – possibly affecting small businesses adversely.

If parking facilities are adequate this will encourage more traffic onto local roads and commuters tend to be hurrying to catch a train or anxious to return home after a day at work. That does not bode well for the safety of pedestrians needing to cross those roads. House prices near to stations tend to attract higher prices and this will increase the profit motive to developers wanting to build on greenfield sites nearby. It will also mean that so-called affordable housing will be even less affordable at these sites. It may also lead, over time, to an undesirable loss of social-rented housing in the vicinity. A minor issue is that stopping at the additional stations will increase the train journey times to and from Guildford town centre on the lines affected.

Detail in Policy wording – flawed drafting:

The policy begins and ends with the weak and totally ineffective word, in planning terms, “expect”.

Contributing through CIL will not necessarily address needs local to the development concerned, and created by it, but may involve solving existing problems elsewhere in the Borough.

Bullets 4 & 5 – improvements to park and ride facilities imply increased car usage from outside the town and the parking provision acknowledges that most journeys will be by car.

Bullet 6 - Has the Vehicle parking Supplementary Planning Document been published? It is not listed as key evidence but the policy refers. How can a policy have been determined with reference to a non-existent part of the evidence base?
Bullets 7, 8, 9 & 10 are weak & aspirational with let-out words such as “facilitate the use of”, “wherever possible”, “contribute” and “where appropriate” (and poorly bulleted!). How will the use of ultra low emission vehicles be facilitated? This is such a vague aspiration as to be meaningless.

The policy only “expects” new developments to contribute, demonstrate adequate provision, etc – it should enforce them. A transport statement AND assessment ought to be a fixed requirement – not a matter for negotiation – while the policy implies that this might be waived even for sites that generate significant amounts of movement.

The construction traffic, noise and pollution generated by meeting the proposed housing number will be excessive. It will have a highly significant impact on the amenity and health of those residents living close to the development sites and those who live on the routes that will be taken by the construction traffic.

The last paragraph says nothing new in planning terms but does mean that the Local Plan has not fully and properly considered the traffic impacts of the proposed sites. For example, the Wisley airfield site will generate a massive increase in vehicle journeys; developments in West Horsley will lead to greater car use, as will the proposed developments at Garlick’s Arch and in Send. The obvious site choice for sustainable development would be on brownfield sites in the town but the Local Plan proposes allocating those sites to the declining retail industry instead.

Paragraph 4.6.21 suggests that sustainable transport is promoted. Far from providing sustainable transport this Plan will generate a massive increase in motor vehicle journeys. The Plan cannot force residents to ride bicycles or walk everywhere.

Introduction:

The spatial development strategy (paragraph 4.6.20 and Policy S2) does not address the development needs of the borough ensuring distances are practical; this is certainly not the case with all the development sites. For example, the Wisley airfield site will generate a massive increase in vehicle journeys; developments in West Horsley will lead to greater car use, as will the proposed developments at Garlick’s Arch and in Send. The obvious site choice for sustainable development would be on brownfield sites in the town but the Local Plan proposes allocating those sites to the declining retail industry instead.

Justification:

Paragraph 4.6.22 seeks to set out a reasoned justification and alleges that development should offer real travel choice by sustainable transport modes. There is little sign that this is being taken seriously enough now.

Paragraph 4.6.23 proposed to bring forward a Vehicle Parking Supplementary Planning Document. It is not clear what to make of this. Failure to provide off-street vehicle parking will not prevent residents owning cars and finding somewhere else to park but it may make life difficult for key workers to commute to their place of work. How can a consultation take place relying on non-existent background documents which are key parts of the Evidence Base? How can anyone comment on non-existent documents, and even if brought forward part-way through the consultation, any comments will be prejudiced by the absence of this informing the start of the consultation.

Paragraph 4.6.24 refers to the Sustainable Movement Corridor. Bus services are aspirational but economic reality may mean that they fail to persist. There is not enough detail published on how the SMC will be delivered – suggesting that it is aspirational rather than fully thought through.

Paragraph 4.6.26 refers to reviewing existing transport facilities and likely transport generation as part of assessing the amount of incremental travel demand. That consideration should have taken place in a robust and detailed manner on a site-by-site basis before the sites were allocated in the Local Plan. It is not sufficient to leave that until the planning application stage as intended by GBC and SCC, given that all sites will be subject to “permission in principle” under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and so will not be capable of subsequent rejection on these grounds.
Paragraph 4.6.27 notes that Development must mitigate its transport impacts. The measures described rely entirely on people taking them up and not dumping their travel information packs in the nearest bin. It is clear that GBC, in response to concerns about elderly and disabled people failing to be coerced into riding bicycles are now suggesting tricycles to overcome this obstacle to their aspirations. They should be aware that while tricycles may help with balance issues they are heavier and harder to ride uphill. While the policy (unusually) notes that mitigation must be provided, in fact this is then diluted to suggest that facilities for electric car charging points and encouragement to car-share can be sufficient; all are optional and therefore meaningless.

However well designed a development is it will make matters worse during construction and if on a greenfield site, it is hard to see how it will achieve environmental benefits. On the other hand, replacing inefficient buildings on a brownfield site could lead to benefits in the long term.

Paragraph 4.6.28 notes “Developers should have regard” to the “Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C”. The only thing that developers have regard for is forcing their application through and maximising their profit – that is the business they are in. Appendix C is lacking in detail. It notes, for example that there will be new town centre bus facilities at a cost of £5-10 million – such vagueness make it clear that no real costing or analysis of proposals has been prepared, and that the Infrastructure improvements proposed have not been properly considered. Having regard to fluid and uncertain proposals is effectively meaningless as a constraint or a requirement.

Paragraph 4.6.29 requires that applications need to address the transport implications of the proposed development. Experience with recent planning applications suggests that developers will do everything in their power to understate transport impacts and we have no faith in GBC and SCC taking a sufficiently robust line on this.

Key Evidence is missing or inadequate.

The Strategic Transport Assessment (SCC 2016) is listed as “forthcoming”, but this plan has been produced in the absence of any strategic transport review.

There are further inadequacies in the Evidence Base, highlighted in the following annexes, which include examples of deficiencies, ambiguities and inadequacies in the transport and infrastructure evidence. This is not a comprehensive list of deficiencies, but serves as an illustration of the poor evidence on which decisions have been based.

**Annexe 1**

Comments on Guildford Borough Transport Study 2016

Page 2 – “address the historic infrastructure deficit” - developers are not required to do this?

Page 2 – It is wrong to claim that the cycle infrastructure along the A25 is good – and many cyclists are not careful, so putting them in contention with pedestrians is not a good idea.

Page 5 – The decision on Heathrow or Gatwick has yet to be taken but airport expansion in the south- east cannot be regarded as sustainable development and, although GBC has no control over such external decisions, its own growth agenda will drive a need for that expansion.

Page 6 An additional weakness is alternative “road closure diversion” routes for the SRN on the LRN

Page 6 Are the “Committed Improvements” actually committed and guaranteed to be delivered?

Page 7 The rail strategy does not provide for Wisley (residents would drive to stations)

Page 7 How long will it take to deliver Crossrail 2 ? “We hope that Crossrail 2 could be operational by 2030, but we are in the very early stages of planning and no decision to build it has been made.”

Page 7 Guildford platform capacity still many years away if ever.
Page 7 The rail strategy anticipates many improvements that have not been secured and may have unintended consequences if they proceed (see above).

Page 7 The Southern Rail Access to Heathrow [see the feasibility study dated December 2015 – although other proposals may be put forward (e.g.by Hounslow)] is still in its early stages and would have significant impacts on open space beyond our Borough. For example, all options in the feasibility study would use Staines Moor SSSI and Option 4 would use Bedfont Lakes Country Park (a Local Nature Reserve and SNCI).

The various options would use existing commercial, residential and highways land in varying degrees. It seems unlikely that a solution will be delivered within the Plan period and removal of highly valued open space with high biodiversity (wherever it is in South-east England) cannot be regarded as sustainable.

Page 10 and 13 There is a stark contrast between the plans for the town centre which involve encouraging a reduction in traffic by reducing roadspace and the plans for the SRN and parts of the LRN which involve increasing capacity. While increasing capacity may reduce some areas of congestion in the short term, history suggests that traffic will rapidly grow until the improved roads are congested once again. This can hardly be regarded as sustainable. A sustainable option would be to apply a very substantial traffic infrastructure constraint on the housing number.

Page 10 While the A3 Guildford Tunnel aspiration has some environmental advantages over widening (in particular for residents living close to the A3), the environmental burden of the construction phase will be far higher and aspects such as location of ventilation stacks and their local effect (in all weather conditions) do not appear to have been considered.

Page 14 Under Weaknesses the point about A roads in Guildford Town also applies to surrounding areas in the Borough and beyond. The anticipated improvements ignore existing congestion to the south and east of Guildford – presumably because SCC’s transport assessment methodology only identifies the tip of the iceberg. The current Plan will see increased congestion and a resultant reduction in air quality in many areas beyond the town centre.

Page 16 “Largely commercial bus services” is seen as a strength whereas it should be seen as a weakness with a trend to reduced subsidies and the provision of bus services, especially in rural areas, being increasingly dependent on commercial gain. It is difficult to see this changing under the current Government cuts philosophy. The point “Subject to business case including funding” under Aspirations demonstrates this point.

Page 18 We welcome the aspiration to “Expand the public realm through significantly extended pedestrian-priority areas”

Page 19 Guildford is well behind other areas in monitoring air quality let alone attempting to reduce it.

The introduction talks about reductions in some pollutants. This may be the case for pollutants such as Sulphur Dioxide, which contributed to the visible London smogs, but it is not true of diesel vehicle emissions which have increased as a result of Government policy including its aggressive growth agenda and population increase through immigration.

30 accessible electric vehicle charging points are only an aspiration and will be nowhere near enough if there is a real shift to electric vehicles.

It is clear from the “Strategy outcomes” that GBC would prefer not to follow other areas in pro-actively tackling air quality.

Page 22/23/24 The timescales indicate that the main rail improvements (Including the two new stations) are unlikely to be delivered until the end of the Plan period or even later. The sites that are supposedly justified by their inclusion will generate a major increase in road traffic in the interim and it may be more difficult to achieve this aspect of modal shift in the longer term. The same can be said about the other traffic infrastructure proposals. Residential development is being scheduled before the infrastructure that it will need.

Page 24 Monitoring – “Increase” needs to be in proportion to population growth as otherwise failure will taken as success. “An Increase in average vehicle speeds” is inconsistent with the desire to reduce the number of persons killed or seriously injured. For example, some A roads pass through residential areas where pedestrians, including schoolchildren, are trying to cross the road at peak times. It is noted that increase in vehicle speeds is only desired in the morning. Going home from work does not seem to matter!
Annexe 2

GTAMS

NPPF and NPPG The Plan ignores the points concerning Green Belt and protecting the environment. GBC have tried to get round this by spinning their messages and using misleading statistics including a major understatement of the area of Green Belt to be removed.

Planning Update (March 2015) – The point in this update concerning Green Belt has been ignored.

Monitoring Indicators:

- Ten years is far too long to wait for information on whether the approach is working or not. The target requires only an increase. This would permit an increase less than that in line with any population growth to be regarded as success. The bar has been set well within the failure range.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5223</th>
<th>Respondent: 8655233 / Kay Mackay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re: Responses to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

I strongly object to GBC Plan in that it has made no provision whatsoever in the Plan to protect the residents in West Clandon (A247) from the vast amount of increased traffic on a road that cannot possibly cope with the additional vehicles yet alone all the HGV's that would be travelling backwards and forwards to these proposed sites in the building of the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5243</th>
<th>Respondent: 8655233 / Kay Mackay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5036  Respondent: 8667713 / Victoria Sinnett  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The link road that runs through the village of West Clandon (A247) is currently a 'hazardous' road as highlighted in a traffic survey, and only today there has been yet another accident on this road with the colliding vehicles mounting the pavement. At present, infant school children walking to the small local school are forced to walk along narrow pavements close to a road which is unsuited to the volume and type of traffic that uses it. Last week I had to jump across the pavement to avoid being hit by a lorry who drove up onto the pavement to avoid another passing the other way, and had my own car struck by another travelling at speed a few months ago. Large vehicles such as lorries and buses are frequently seen mounting the pavements at significant speeds to avoid collisions with one another and will no doubt in time lead to serious injury or death. A development as proposed in the local plan will significantly increase the likelihood of this occurring, as a direct result of the obvious increase in traffic in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5048  Respondent: 8667713 / Victoria Sinnett  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/615  Respondent: 8667937 / Gordon Holliday  Agent: 

Section page number 46 of 484  Document page number 1601
Before every blade of grass is destroyed, every tree hacked down and every living creature is slaughtered to accommodate 1,150 house in Normandy, I would ask you to make sure the roads that service this area are in-place before a house is built. The roads concerned are the A3, A31, A323, Westward Lane (D class) and Glaziers Lane (D class). A 'D' class lane is one that has no structural foundations and is little more than a farm track. With the influx of thousands of lorries and cars these roads and lanes are not fit for purpose in their present state. This would have to be addressed immediately and be the first priority.

The railway line from Aldershot to Guildford must be updated and have more stations in order to get some of the cars off the roads. New stations for the Guildford University, Park Barn, Wanborough and Ash must be in-place and free adequate parking to accompany these stations. Without these travelling arrangements it goes without saying that chaos will be achieved to those unfortunate enough to buy a house in these areas. The level crossing at Ash station must be done away with and a bridge put in place because this is a major pinch-point on the A323. The bridge is essential and must be one of your first considerations. The traffic in this area is a total shambles in the rush-hour let alone when hundreds more homes are built.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attatched documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp171/1091  **Respondent:** 8687041 / Michael Aaronson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I strongly support the welcome emphasis in the 2017 Plan on improved infrastructure for cycling in, into, and around Guildford. At present there is no safe way of crossing Guildford on a bicycle, especially from east to west. The Plan document rightly refers to "a fragmented and disjointed network of cycle routes, consisting of routes both on and adjacent to local roads, with the latter often comprising shared lanes for pedestrians and cyclists. Many cycle lanes and tracks are narrow and some are unattractive to the average cyclist." This is very true, and I hope that as this Plan is implemented the Council is as good as its word and delivers a first class cycling infrastructure that will lead to a reduction in car journeys and improved quality of life for all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1089  **Respondent:** 8687265 / Dagero Ltd (David Roberts)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )**

POLICY I3 - Sustainable transport for new developments

I OBJECT. This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated...
public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust.

One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day, as I used to do. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2641  Respondent: 8693153 / Vicki Willetts  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT): • Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford. • Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development. • Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. I.e. most residents! • Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8894  Respondent: 8694369 / Nicola Ogilvie Smals  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3: sustainable transport for new developments
Sustainable transport modes are encouraged in various sections of the local plan. In order to embrace sustainable transport modes new developments must facilitate trips by walking and cycling. Whilst East Horsley has a railway station, the development sites A37, A38, A40 and A41 are not within reasonable (defined as less than 1km) walking distance therefore requiring trips to the station by car; the station car park is at capacity. Legible walking routes would require substantial upgrade to street scenes, for example there are no streetlamps in West Horsley North.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14693   **Respondent:**  8694977 / James Lewis   **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

There are huge uncertainties as to where and how transport needs will be met. I live off Burpham Lane and roads like that cannot cope with the volumes of traffic that will be generated as a consequence.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14695   **Respondent:**  8694977 / James Lewis   **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

There are but vague hopes that a station may be built and no commitment for it from BR. Such a development would put further strain on Burpham roads.

If a tunnel is necessary then that must be planned first not fitted in some years later.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4070   **Respondent:**  8704417 / Philip Ashfield   **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

If these building projects were carried out then there would be total traffic gridlock not only in the local area but on the M25 and A3 and, of course on every one of the smaller roads in Surrey and the surrounding Counties.

Amongst my other objections to the draft local plan, where no consideration has been given, are:

There are not sufficient Transport links (railways, buses or roads).
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15028  **Respondent:** 8708545 / Nigel Wicks  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object because of concerns about poor air quality (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4504  **Respondent:** 8709249 / Geoff Spink  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY I3**

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4740  **Respondent:** 8711841 / Rosmarie Roberts-Kunz  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):
• Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
• Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Policy assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
• Unrealistic belief most people can be persuaded out of their cars to walk or cycle. Many large groups can’t or won’t do this – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. In other words, most residents!
• Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The sustainability of the settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general shift from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport, this will not happen everyone will still drive, especially at the proposed Wisley Airfield site where they would be isolated. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station, the station car parks are all full. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent. Many roads flood badly and have no footpaths.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not able to cycle.

Park-and-rides are part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper/easier to park in town.

The addition of two new stations appears good but will slow down train journeys, which are already packed and what the point when we are told the Waterloo lines have no extra time slots for extra trains, we are not cattle.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11739  Respondent: 8725697 / J A Ottey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The extra pollution, which will be created

Guildford cannot cope with the existing traffic without having any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3232  Respondent: 8726529 / Eric Palmer  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

Object
Policy needs expanding, and to have more solutions.
While I support the concept but fail to see how it can be applied for new out of town Greenbelt sites. We are in the surrey HILLS it isn’t flat and cycling is not practical in many cases.
Bus travel is being scaled down by Surrey CC, and private investment will only be on profitable routes. No bus hub is yet clear to link busses and trains.
The further from the town centre, the less sustainable and more car dependant the development will be.

Object
We support the concept but fail to see how it can be applied for new out of town Greenbelt sites.

We are in the Surrey Hills it isn’t flat and cycling is not practical in many cases.

Bus travel is being scaled down by Surrey CC, and private investment will only be on profitable routes. No bus hub is yet clear to link busses and trains.

The further from the town centre, the less sustainable and more car dependant the development will be.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/2069  Respondent: 8729217 / Karen Stevens  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy ID3 (3), which states: “New development providing, contributing and/or close to the routes of the proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor in the Guildford urban area will have regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document.”

The Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document does not appear to have been published so GBC cannot consult meaningfully on this policy.

The whole concept of the Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC) appears vague and uncertain – what began as a car-free route through Guildford for pedestrians, cyclists and buses/trams has been downgraded to a bus/cycle lane through some of the busiest sections of Guildford’s road network. Without widening sections of the route (which is not proposed), the SMC would reduce capacity on an already overstretched road network. This will be a particular problem at pinch-points along the route, such as the A3 underpass at Egerton Road, where cars are at a standstill most weekday mornings during the University term time (Figure 9(a) and Figure 9(b)).

Proposals to introduce a significant bus service to proposed key development sites to the town centre and other key destinations (Policy A26 Infrastructure requirement (5)), whilst a good idea in theory, are not practical. Guildford borough is too rural (with villages too far apart) and the town’s population too small and low density to sustain a viable passenger transport system. Furthermore, there appears to be no real expectation that the SMC would achieve a modal shift and reduce car movements significantly so it is questionable why GBC would propose expenditure of up to £250m on the scheme.

[Figure 9(a)] above and [Figure 9(b)] – The strategic movement corridor will reduce capacity of Egerton Road passing beneath the A3 during peak times

[Figure 10] – Concentric circles drawn from University of Surrey’s Senate House demonstrate how remote Blackwell Farm is from the central hub of Guildford, with its existing transport provision

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 📄 KJS 2017 consultation response (rev 01F).pdf (7.6 MB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6706  Respondent: 8731649 / Ian Slater  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13928  Respondent: 8732993 / Michael Weber  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15814  Respondent: 8732993 / Michael Weber  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5109</th>
<th>Respondent: 8741377 / Lisanne Mealing</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS.** Policy 13 I OBJECT, as often the proposed sites are remote from existing bus stops, stations and even roads with pavements. This assumes that people will stop using cars as transport methods. This assumption is unrealistic as has been proved time and time again in new developments resulting in parking chaos around the developments as residents try and park near home and traffic snarl ups.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5112</th>
<th>Respondent: 8741377 / Lisanne Mealing</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure.**

This will cause more congestion to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, which have narrow roads, country lanes and no footpaths. More houses will increase danger and unsustainable volumes of traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7670</th>
<th>Respondent: 8743073 / Darrell Howard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)**

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Policy 13 - “Sustainable Transport for new developments” indicates that developers will be expected to propose and secure travel plans for their developments and contribute to the transport arrangements for the able and disabled. The words “will be expected” are pathetically weak and developers will do everything in their power to avoid or minimise such commitments. As with the 2014 draft Local Plan, it is deeply concerning that very little work has been done to quantify the infrastructure requirements that will need to be implemented to support the proposed increase in housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13874  Respondent: 8743137 / Ben Woodford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3921  Respondent: 8744161 / Michael Bridge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3942  Respondent: 8744257 / Mary E Bridge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9315</th>
<th>Respondent: 8744417 / Mark &amp; Gillie Hammersley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12313</th>
<th>Respondent: 8749473 / Charlotte Beckett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8588</th>
<th>Respondent: 8751105 / Amanda Harris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6544  Respondent: 8752097 / Lucy Meade-King  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Chinthurst Lane is not wide enough to accommodate more traffic. It is already busy and if we are to preserve the character of the roads and lanes that form the boundaries of this area we must avoid erosion of the private verges and common land which would be inevitable if attempts were made to widen it. Upgrading, widening and imposition of formal highways, street lighting and fences would suburbanise a rural part of the Village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16292  Respondent: 8768609 / Sue Brown  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4. There are not enough jobs in Guildford for all the potential new residents so most will be commuting in all directions but particularly to London. There is no infrastructure in place. There may be a new station but there are not enough trains possible to be run on the existing lines. Already no seats available on morning or evening trains on the main line and branch lines to Waterloo. Traffic on the A3 is excessive and the roads in Guildford Centre and around cannot cope now, it only needs one small event to cause havoc to thousands and delays of hours. Park and ride is affected by any road problems and doesn't run long enough hours for commuters to and from London.

5. The Wisley Junction 10 where the A3 meets the M25 is already an accident black spot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12523  Respondent: 8769793 / Laura Richards  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am a long term resident of West Clandon, having grown up here myself, and now bringing up my own young children in the village.

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan and would make in addition one key point upfront regarding traffic – I have seen first-hand over the years the increase in traffic through the village on a road (the A247) which simply cannot cope with it. The pavements are narrow, the road is narrow and there are difficult bends and twists. The cars and large lorries travel far too fast through the village and there are too many of them. Only this week there was a serious accident causing 2 cars to fully mount the pavement, and this happened just minutes after a group of children passed by that point walking to school. It can surely only be a matter of time before there is a tragic loss of life on this road and as such I object in the strongest possible terms to any further development which leads to even more traffic passing through West Clandon – including the proposed developments at both Gosden Hill Farm and Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12541  **Respondent:** 8769793 / Laura Richards  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY I3**

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5074  **Respondent:** 8770177 / Phil Attwood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.
1. **POLICY I3**

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16700</th>
<th>Respondent: 8772801 / David French</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12858</th>
<th>Respondent: 8773377 / Anthony &amp; Anne Bond</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guildford, unlike towns around us, will see unconstrained housing growth. We already have a congested town, with unresolved issues surrounding traffic flow in the centre of the town.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14454</th>
<th>Respondent: 8773377 / Anthony &amp; Anne Bond</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford is already extremely congested and there is little evidence that sufficient improvement to the town centre infrastructure is part of this inadequate plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12120  Respondent: 8773409 / G B Lovegrove  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our taxes are paying for this completely destructive plan when currently money cannot be found to repair the current disgusting state of our roads in the village

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12122  Respondent: 8773409 / G B Lovegrove  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The roads in the village will not be adequate for the extremely increased traffic. (A visual check on the current cars per house in the village is 2. Equals an increase of some 28,000 cars!!)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17029  Respondent: 8787969 / K Britton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

I am already aware that there is pollution from vehicles when I am working near the road behind my hedge in my garden.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17000  Respondent: 8797601 / David Newell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

> Stronger assurances should be included in the plan that development can only commence when required infrastructure improvements have been secured.

> The A247 through Clandon is overburdened already with excessive heavy traffic.

> It is unsuitable as an A road in the first place since it has, in the Village three pinch points so narrow as to prevent two lorries to pass each other. Lorries regularly mount the pavement at speed already. Any plan should include proposals to provide other traffic routes away from the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7576  Respondent: 8798849 / David Williams  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from severe traffic congestion. Much of West Clandon is deemed by Guildford Borough Council to be a Conservation Area and we residents are required to abide by those rules. Is not GBC also duty bound to protect and conserve the area? Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the villages on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon, The Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles have, of necessity, to mount the pavement. With a primary school, two pubs and a children’s playground, quite clearly the village should be protected from, and not be forced to take yet more, traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12751</th>
<th>Respondent: 8800545 / Bill Taylor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that &quot;Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental Impacts and impacts on amenity and health.&quot; The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4164</th>
<th>Respondent: 8801473 / Jerry Keane</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keens Lane is topi narrow to have two way traffic .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional traffic accessing Keens lane will cause further congestion on the Worplesdon Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roundabout currently at the top of Keens lane is dangerous as users treat it as a chicane .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The congestion on the Worplesdon road especially at peak times is currently unacceptable adding more housing in the area will significantly increase the traffic .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1635</th>
<th>Respondent: 8802497 / P M Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First, the increased traffic implicit in a significant number of additional new houses. Over the period I have lived in East Horsley, the experience of walking down Ockham Road North and Ockham Road South to the station or the shops has become increasingly fraught, as more and more traffic, including heavy vehicles as well as domestic vehicles, charge by unrelentingly. These roads are narrow and the speed and heavyweight of traffic currently using them act as a severe deterrent to many people who would otherwise go out on foot rather than by car. The significant numbers of new houses currently being proposed under the new plan would only intensify this situation, and would seem designed further to discourage pedestrians, and make the roads – and of course, the parking at both ends of East Horsley – even more congested and unviable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4667  **Respondent:** 8803617 / Timothy Bruton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2. Proposed developments on Sites A42, A43, A43A, A44.

I wish to object to the proposed developments on these sites. The combination of these new housing proposals gives rise to population increase of over 25%. This is a clear overdevelopment of the three settlements. The lack of infrastructure has already been noted. In particular, the A247, the main artery through Send is extremely congested. Send is a classic linear village and most of the house along the A247 were constructed before the car era and lack off-road parking facilities and inconsequence many cars are permanently parked on road. This is a source of traffic congestion with long tailbacks in the morning and evening rush hours and delays at other times when large vehicles traverse the village. The situation will be exacerbated later this year when the new St Bede’s school opens (Planning application 16/P/00033 Approved GBC 31st March 2016) as access to both infants and junior school will now be from the A247 effected doubling the number of pupils arriving in that way. While the planning application included a School Green Travel Plan to minimise car journeys to the school the mitigation measures of increased cycling and walking are difficult to implement as footpaths and cycle paths are inadequate. Public transport is not an option as no buses pass the school. Inevitably increased car use will result giving more congestion with increased risks to children.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/128  **Respondent:** 8804929 / Helen Beckett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Traffic

The increase in traffic on East Lane, in particular, will be intolerable with the proposal of over 345 new households impacting on this road (potentially up to 750 more cars?). It is already congested during school times from Nightingale Avenue and Northcote Road. This will have a massive impact on our day-to-day lives.

2000 houses are being planned for Wisley Airfield. Many of these potential residents will be driving in and out of Horsley to use the station and shops. **We simply DO NOT have the capacity for additional parking at Horsley Station and local shops. The Station car park is currently full every weekday as it is. It will become impossible to use the train as there is no alternative parking.**

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2369  **Respondent:** 8806305 / Laurence Cook  **Agent:**
POLICY I3 - Sustainable transport for new developments

I OBJECT. This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust.

One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I have lived in the Guildford area for most of my life. During that time London has spread right out to the M25 and its impact beyond. I drive 16 miles to work and it usually takes me about an hour and can easily take longer. And it doesn't take a great deal and the whole of Guildford can be backed up with traffic. We are clearly not coping with the number of people who live here already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5263  Respondent: 8810113 / Louise Stewart  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that the infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels, with such a large increase in housing the roads will not be able to accommodate the huge increase in traffic. There are currently serious delays on all roads during the rush hour and they are busy at all times of the day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5278  Respondent: 8810113 / Louise Stewart  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16544  Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16653  Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9314  Respondent: 8812097 / Clare Benzikie  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2769  Respondent: 8813601 / Gaenor Richards  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns.

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can even result in premature death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4021  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the last minute site allocation A43a for a new on/off slip roads onto the A3 as the local roads already have a congestion problem. All the local small roads would be at daily gridlock due to the HUGE influx of through traffic.

I object to the danger of the increased volume of traffic that will arise from the A43a on/off ramps to pedestrians and cyclists. Many of our small local roads do not have pavements and very few cycle lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4024  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 40 houses and travellers pitches on A44 Send Hill site as the small single track road is not capable of being used regularly by increased traffic of any kind and it is not possible to make it any bigger.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4025  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site allocation A25 Gosden Farm as the impact of the extra traffic through Send and Ripley to access the A3/M25 would be vast.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the additional load that will be caused to public transport in the Send, Ripley, Clandon, Wisley and Gosden Farm areas with increased population. There is a lack of public transport. Local stations are already overcrowded. Car parks already overflow into neighbouring residential roads. Bus services in the area have recently been reduced.

I object to health suffering due to vastly increased air, noise and light pollution of all the additional traffic that would pass through the Send, Ripley and Clandon areas. The A3/M25 pollution is already in excess of permitted levels and building 2,000 extra homes with their extra vehicles at Wisley Airfield (A35) will only increase this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4030  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery Send (A42) because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is too small a narrow country lane to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. There is already planning permission for 64 houses at the Tannery and the building of a marina which will already exacerbate the congestion issue. The lane was not built for heavy use.

I wish my objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Local Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6148  Respondent: 8817953 / Sheena Ewen  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states: "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to further highways congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute as traffic spills onto roads in built up residential areas and will lead to greater levels of air pollution, which in turn will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16445  Respondent: 8818625 / Beth and Frank Fuller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/879  Respondent: 8818753 / Chris Bussicott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In addition to children requiring education, the proposed new houses will contain adults requiring work. Where in the Horsley do the jobs for these people exist? Perhaps the planners think that they will be commuters. If so the planners haven't attempted to travel from Horsley or Effingham Station in the rush hour. The station car parks are already full and the trains crowded even before they pull into our stations. There simply isn't the room for hundreds more people.

Perhaps the planners think that these new residents will drive to work and I understand that there is a proposal to build an additional A3 intersection in the area; perhaps the planners have included this In their proposals in an attempt to alleviate the local gridlock that the additional home owners will create trying to drive their children to non-existent local schools or themselves to work in jobs that aren't in the area. If so, then these planners clearly haven't travelled on the A3 northbound towards London or southbound towards Guildford recently, where the traffic is already at a crawl throughout the rush hour periods, even if it is on a rare day when the M25 is flowing adequately.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13242  Respondent: 8820353 / Gillian Beaton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/682</th>
<th>Respondent: 8820417 / Simon Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the former Wisley airfield is clearly at odds with revised policy 1D3. It is simply not possible to offer a sustainable transport policy for a site which is positioned in this location in the middle of nowhere, with no local amenities, narrow country lanes, no lighting and no public transport facilities. I object to the inclusion of the former Wisley airfield within the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/794</th>
<th>Respondent: 8820929 / A J Stuart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are very many brown field sites locally, not least the old disused, unsightly and barren Wisley Airfield site, which has for over 20 years been included in various planned projects, then turned down, only to appear again under a different project banner. The site is on a major inter-section, where access could be provided for those wishing to commute into London and surrounding towns. Were the infrastructure and facilities within that site (school, GP, shops) built responsibly this site could solve very many of the borough's housing requirements into the future. Wisley Airfield along with other brown field sites must be considered for any proposed housing over and above the small villages which surround that area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13154</th>
<th>Respondent: 8824609 / Richard Sands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPP16/5564</td>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8826081 / Simon Wilcockson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPP16/5575</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8826081 / Simon Wilcockson</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· I object that housing on the Green Belt will increase traffic bringing increased danger and pollution and slower journey times on our already overcrowded village roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPP16/13388</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8826369 / Tim Madge</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **POLICY I3** |
| I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3) |
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13167  Respondent: 8826529 / Martin Barker  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Also in Key Facts, para 2.7, you note the high car ownership and levels of movement. We have the A323, A322, and A320 through our parish all of which suffer from significant congestion at present. A large increase in houses, let alone 71%, would not be sustainable with these roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6103  Respondent: 8826913 / Gemma Harrison  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12697  Respondent: 8827169 / Mark Blowers  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thirdly I object to the Local Plan and the proposed developments as it will have a significant impact on existing infrastructures which are already at their limits particularly at peak times. Train stations and their car parks are already...
full to capacity and the road systems are full at peak hours. The B roads that run through the Horsley villages are not designed to take the existing levels of traffic and the proposed developments will only make this worse. The proposed development at the Wisley airfield will not provide affordable housing for those that need it as the prices will be driven by existing housing in the area. The proposed changes to the infrastructure are inadequate and will not address the issues created by this very large development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4574  Respondent: 8827777 / Mary English  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2997  Respondent: 8827809 / Robert Wood  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns.

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that 'Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.' The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6511  Respondent: 8828385 / Thomas Meredith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the very large proposed development of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will wipe out large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land. It would also prove to be catastrophic to the surrounding small roads, which would not be able to cope, and on the A3 and M25 interchange nearby.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11103  Respondent: 8828545 / Anjali Mittal  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/80  Respondent: 8829665 / Gary Falcon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable. Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14745  Respondent: 8831393 / John Dumbleton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposals that I have seen are likely to cause grid lock in Burpham if Gosden Hill Farm is developed as proposed. It would only increase traffic congestion as the roads to be used cannot take cycle and bus lanes in the way proposed without having a detrimental effect on vehicle movements due to the narrowness of the roads that it is proposed would be included. Vehicles that would still need to access the town centre would suffer serious delays.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17350  Respondent: 8834401 / Property Consultant (John Everritt)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The effect it has on the A 247 / A25 linking into the A3. In terms of extra traffic. Please witness the horrific traffic jams going North on the A 3 in the week day mornings close to the Royal Surrey Hospital access.

From 15.00 hours, towards Guildford at the spot where the draft Plan envisages an additional junction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8295  Respondent: 8835425 / Martin O'Hara  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**TRANSPORT & HIGHWAY CONSIDERATIONS**

Any traffic generated from the proposed Site Allocation housing sites in West Horsley and East Horsley will only further contribute to traffic congestion in the area. The existing road system is appropriate for a semi-rural village, such as West Horsley; indeed its appearance and scale are another important characteristic of the village.

Many of the traffic routes are little more than lanes, many with pavements on only one side of the carriageway. When you consider however that many households now have at least two cars, the potential increase in traffic, should the proposed development take place, could easily overwhelm the existing infrastructure and lead to serious, and potentially life threatening, safety concerns.

No specific proposal as to how GBC intend to address these concerns has been detailed in the Local Plan nor in the Draft Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016. This is clearly unacceptable, given that GBC are making a proposal for such excessive residential development within, and around, the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPP16/8296</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8835425 / Martin O'Hara</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, GBC are still championing the creation of a new significant settlement under Policy A35: Land at former Wisley Airfield, Ockham. This is potentially a double whammy for local infrastructure, and in particular local roads, from which it may never recover!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would therefore also take this opportunity to <strong>OBJECT to Policy A35: Land at former Wisley airfield, Ockham.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst Horsley station has frequent trains to London and Guildford, car parking at the station is limited and is often full during the week. There is no adjacent land available for additional car parking provision. A significant increase in the village population will obviously increase the pressure on station car parking and traffic movements to and from the station on already narrow and, at times, congested local roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is currently a regular bus service operating along the A246 between Guildford and Leatherhead, however this is really only of use to residents at the very southern end of West Horsley. There is also currently an extremely limited bus service along East Lane and The Street, through West Horsley village, which only operates 2 or 3 times per day between Monday to Friday only. There is no service at the weekends. Any development of new homes at this end of the village would necessitate an improvement in this service for it to be considered in any way sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments; GBC proposes that “We will expect developments will contribute…..We will expect new development to…. We will expect new all applications for ….”. Is that really the best we can hope for? That GBC ‘expects’ things from developers rather than ‘requires’ them! The policy as drafted ‘has no teeth’ and is clearly open to abuse from developers or housebuilders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would therefore ask that <strong>Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments should be AMENDED</strong> to state that GBC require these things rather than expect them!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPP16/15782</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8836129 / Roger Shapley</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This is outwith the competence of the borough council and lies with the local highway authority, Surrey County Council, who's budgets have been severely reduced in recent years and make this aspiration impossible to envisage becoming a reality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPP16/7102</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8837313 / Maria Baker</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3) Paragraph 6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments. This is another aspirational policy, not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general ‘modal shift’ from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

I like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.
The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented. Ie. Cost of housing will increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport. The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths. The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK. The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day, as I used to do. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times. Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town. Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services. The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7349  Respondent: 8845025 / A Henderson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I live in Shere Road, West Horsley and since I moved here 12 years ago, it has become a 'cut-through' for lorries and cars. Despite the speed limit having been lowered to 30 mph it still happens. There are no pavements and only a few grass verges that are walkable. School children are at risk on their way to school as they have to walk in the road. All of this is without adding more and more people and vehicles to the equation. Recently it has taken a considerably longer time to get out of Shere Road onto the A246 because of the volume of traffic. It has always been difficult at school times but it is now throughout the day. The prospect of these housing developments being added to the mix is extremely worrying. This situation, of course, also exists at Ockham Road South and The Street, West Horsley.

A leaflet from Dandara was delivered a few days ago and this has added insult to injury! A more patronising, self interested, hyperbole I have yet to read. Trying to convince local residents that they are "assisting us" by persuading GBC that their proposed development next to the roundabout by Bell & Colville is an advantageous alternative to existing
proposed sites.. This development would be next to Shere Road onto the Epsom Road A246, adding chaos to frustratiion. A conflict of interests I fear.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/679  Respondent: 8846529 / Vera Bulbeck  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re: Inappropriate Development on the Green Belt, Normandy 2nd letter

I would like to raise my objections regarding the development of 1,100 homes in our lovely rural village of Normandy. This will totally ruin the heart of our village and destroy our rural environment. As you are aware from past consultations the planning applications on the above site is not a welcome proposition, for a number of reasons.

• There is already a problem with the traffic; this can only get worse with all the extra housing, and the extra cars etc using the small rural roads. In Westwood lane there is the extra problem of the railway bridge with one way traffic. It is utter chaos in the evening trying to get onto the Guildford/Aldershot Road during the peak times. It can take as long as 40 minutes to drive a mile towards Ash. The secondary school and primary school is going to cause more problems with children being dropped off and picked up for school. The roads are so small and not wide enough for two cars to pass. One has only to come and see the state of the grass verges all around the area to establish vehicles have to mount the pavement to get past other vehicles, at the present times with the huge Lorries using our village as short cut to the A31.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13402  Respondent: 8850817 / Sandra Woods  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object on the grounds that the extra housing and the traffic arising from it will exacerbate the parking situation at Horsley Station and the village, together with worse congestion on Ockham Road North and South than already exists at peak times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16373  Respondent: 8850881 / N Reardon Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
3. Local Roads: The roads are already in a poor state of repair and struggle to cope with the existing levels of daily traffic. At certain times of the day, several roads in the village are especially congested and it can be difficult to move around. Many local roads have no footpath or very narrow footpaths with the majority unlit. It can therefore be quite dangerous to use these footpaths, especially in winter and at night. There is absolutely no scope for additional roads or widening of roads due to existing houses meaning that the current problem will just be exacerbated if development on the scale suggested is allowed to take place. If it is assumed that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means that there will be, potentially, 6,000 more cars within a 3-mile radius of East and West Horsley. The impact on local roads will be horrendous.

4. Public transport: The West Horsley bus service is very limited and only operates 3 times per day, weekdays only and not at peak commuter times. The bus service operating from Guildford to Leatherhead travels along the A246 at the southern end of the village but is really only of use to residents living at that end of the village. Although the train service from Horsley to London and Guildford is generally good/frequent, parking at Horsley Station is already under significant pressure and the car park is often full. There is no land adjacent to the existing car park for additional parking. There is already a problem with rail passengers parking in the East Horsley Village Hall car park (thereby denying bona fide village hall users from parking there) and I would imagine this will only increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3095  Respondent: 8852289 / John F. Wood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in traffic, (at least 25,000 vehicles,) that the Proposed Plan will incur. Gridlock will prevail in many locations, e.g. A3/Wisley interchange, the A3/M25, and also the A246/Ockham Road South. Our local roads in the Horsleys, and Ockham are narrow, winding lanes and will become very dangerous with greatly increased traffic, putting the many cyclists at risk. There are already unavoidable “pinch points”, such as in Ockham Road South, where vehicles find it difficult to pass a bus, lorry or even large van

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7264  Respondent: 8854273 / D.G. Peters  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Major transport issues such as links between rail and bus terminals need to be resolved before the Local Plan can be complete.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10607  Respondent: 8855969 / Jonathan Murphy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in traffic, (at least 25,000 vehicles,) that the Proposed Plan will incur. Gridlock will prevail in many locations, e.g. A3/Wisley interchange, the A3/M25, and also the A246/Ockham Road South. Our local roads in the Horsleys, and Ockham are narrow, winding lanes and will become very dangerous with greatly increased traffic, putting the many cyclists at risk. There are already unavoidable “pinch points”, such as in Ockham Road South, where vehicles find it difficult to pass a bus, lorry or even large van

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/2530  **Respondent:** 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. **I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns** (Policy I3)

   Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/17793  **Respondent:** 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

**cart horse would sum up this policy**

I object very strongly.

The plans for sites such as wisely and Blackwell farm such that people would walk or cycle or use buses beggars belief. People buying houses at those prices will drive and each house will have 2,3 or 4 cars.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/17793  **Respondent:** 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments

This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

I support the concept and aim but OBJECT on the grounds that the practicalities of sustainable transport have not been properly considered, it is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable. Not everyone can cycle all the time.
How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process - the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle – and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?

The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a hoppa bus can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle. While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations there could be unintended consequences.

Once again we see the word “expect” used which means the policy has no teeth. The word “expect” must be replaced with the word “require” so that this policy is enforceable.

There are a number of problems with this policy.

Congestion is a widely recognised factor in the local area of Guildford, and this is a major factor in the public response to the proposed housing numbers, which represents more than a 25% increase in housing numbers in a borough that is already profoundly congested. [Source: SHMA p61: itself sourced from ONS for 2013.] Residents recognise that to increase the population by this level within the existing transport provision is not feasible, and this informs much of the public response to the proposed level of housing accommodation.

It is not clear that this recognition, which is widespread through the borough, is shared by those who have drafted the Local Plan.

Guildford is a commuter town, which (compared to London) offers better quality of life and lower house prices, so it will continue to be a commuter town for the foreseeable future. As a result, access to the stations for commuting is of significance. It is not realistic to assume that traffic to stations for commuters can be replaced either by bus services (slow, intermittent, expensive, and in many cases absent completely) or by cycle. There is a capacity issue of car parking at the station, which effectively creates an absolute constraint on the feasibility of commuting from Guildford.

Cycling is attractive, and, for the urban young, especially students, it is both practical and cheap, and can be quick. However, as noted, those en route to work cannot be assumed to be able to cycle in working clothes. Elderly members of the community, those transporting small children, and the disabled cannot participate in cycling except to a limited extent. Effectively the "average" person deemed to be capable of cycling to substitute for car trips is an able-bodied adult not travelling to somewhere where smart clothing is required, not needing to arrive clean (or with showering facilities on arrival, not provided by all employers); this is not sufficiently widespread in terms of the local demographic for travellers that it should be allowed to determine policy – and of course, not needing to transport, for example, supermarket shopping after the trip. What about the disabled? the elderly? those looking after more than one child? Are they to be housebound? This is not a reasonable strategy. Before transport and buildings are determined on the basis of such a policy, it is also imperative that safe cycle routes are implemented through the borough. Cycling in winter on rural roads is inherently more dangerous. Upgrading these roads would not be feasible in terms of cost nor desirable in terms of local character.

Cycle lanes which disappear into normal traffic lanes, which travel over potholes and which allow cyclists to be threatened by HGVs are not conducive to wider cycle usage, nor should wider cycle usage be encouraged until it can be demonstrated that it is safe, which currently, locally, it is not. The A25 cycle corridor scheme (Part of LRN1) will exchange the risk between cyclists and vehicles sharing space for the risk between cyclists and pedestrians sharing space. Much of the A25 has no pedestrian area anyway outside the urban space. Many cyclists travel at high speed and they will be put into conflict with pedestrians including mothers with very young children and schoolchildren many of whom need to cross the road and hence cross the cycleway. This is likely to lead to accidents and pedestrians are being disadvantaged.

Road capacity reduces as average speeds come down due to congestion. Where proper cycle lanes or off-road lanes are not provided then it is inevitable that safe driving will lead to reduced average motor vehicle speeds and gap development
in the traffic stream. Both these effects act to reduce the capacity of our local road network. This loss of capacity has not been recognised in the Transport Strategy.

The concept of the park and ride with access into the town limited for those who live outside the town, is similarly flawed. Park and Ride is expensive, cumbersome and slow. It should be noted that in Oxford it has had a disastrous impact on small local retailers which is a retail segment that it is important to retain and support.

Use of park and rides increases the use of the strategic road network by local users, which is not what it is designed to do.

This proposal is combined with aggressive exclusion from the town of those who are living in peripheral communities, which will increasingly resemble housing estates. This is a strategy for sink estates through Surrey instead of the Green Belt - this is not a strategy for growth. Head offices will choose to go elsewhere, because highly skilled staff and management in the cutting edge industries that GBC wants to encourage, will not choose to live in a dense housing estate.

The existing extent of traffic congestion has not been fully recognised. As a consequence the impact of the various development scenarios has been understated and the infrastructure costs are an understatement.

The transport studies are incomplete and unpublished and this should have led to deferral of consideration of the Local Plan consultation process until it was possible to revise the plan post publication of the studies. This matter was raised by a number of councillors at the Full Council meeting on 24 May 2016 when the consultation was approved, but a motion to defer was overturned by the majority party.

Cross-subsidy in terms of infrastructure is envisaged. The infrastructure deficit needs to be resolved before there are large numbers of new residents exacerbating the current congestion. The funding of the new developments through CIL and S 106 is expected to contribute to the transport impacts across the borough, and there is negligible concern for the transport problems created within those new developments or in areas adjacent to them. This is not acceptable to existing residents and is likely to cause some problems with the future residents too, who may arguably feel aggrieved that the road funding associated with their developments is being subverted to other areas. While this may be permissible under the revised CIL regulations it is questionable whether it is morally acceptable to grant planning permission to build on the Green Belt in order to cross subsidise the building of roads or other infrastructure in the town centre or elsewhere across the borough or outside it.

Insetting of villages and the proposed relaxation of planning restrictions anywhere outside settlements (Green Belt or not), implied in P2, will lead to substantial infilling that will not require traffic assessment but will contribute a highly significant amount of additional car journeys overall - by a more insidious process than the large developments proposed.

Costs for rail or bus travel could be substantially reduced and would incentivise their use; but these are outside the remit of GBC and so cannot be encouraged by them.

It remains to be seen whether the proposed new stations will be delivered as they are not entirely within the council’s control. While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations there could be unintended consequences as the roads local to both sites are heavily congested. If parking facilities are inadequate this could lead to a need for onerous parking restrictions on roads nearby – possibly affecting small businesses adversely.

If parking facilities are adequate this will encourage more traffic onto local roads and commuters tend to be hurrying to catch a train or anxious to return home after a day at work. That does not bode well for the safety of pedestrians needing to cross those roads. House prices near to stations tend to attract higher prices and this will increase the profit motive to developers wanting to build on greenfield sites nearby. It will also mean that so-called affordable housing will be even less affordable at these sites. It may also lead, over time, to an undesirable loss of social-rented housing in the vicinity. A minor issue is that stopping at the additional stations will increase the train journey times to and from Guildford town centre on the lines affected.

**Detail in Policy wording – flawed drafting:**

The policy begins and ends with the weak and totally ineffective word, in planning terms, “expect”. 

---

Section page number 91 of 484
Contributing through CIL will not necessarily address needs local to the development concerned, and created by it, but may involve solving existing problems elsewhere in the Borough.

Bullets 4 & 5 – improvements to park and ride facilities imply increased car usage from outside the town and the parking provision acknowledges that most journeys will be by car.

Bullet 6 - Has the Vehicle parking Supplementary Planning Document been published? It is not listed as key evidence but the policy refers. How can a policy have been determined with reference to a non-existent part of the evidence base?

Bullets 7, 8, 9 & 10 are weak & aspirational with let-out words such as “facilitate the use of”, “wherever possible”, “contribute” and “where appropriate” (and poorly bulleted!). How will the use of ultra low emission vehicles be facilitated? This is such a vague aspiration as to be meaningless.

The policy only “expects” new developments to contribute, demonstrate adequate provision, etc – it should enforce them. A transport statement AND assessment ought to be a fixed requirement – not a matter for negotiation – while the policy implies that this might be waived even for sites that generate significant amounts of movement.

The construction traffic, noise and pollution generated by meeting the proposed housing number will be excessive. It will have a highly significant impact on the amenity and health of those residents living close to the development sites and those who live on the routes that will be taken by the construction traffic.

The last paragraph says nothing new in planning terms but does mean that the Local Plan has not fully and properly considered the traffic impacts of the proposed sites. We have experience of how misleading the TAs produced by developers can be – using averaging techniques and understated baseline figures, days when schools are not operating and many other devices to pull the wool over the eyes of planning authorities. This aspect is a denial of responsibility by GBC. The result is that Green Belt and countryside will be released for development when fuller consideration of traffic impacts at the Local Plan stage should have prevented that. If the planning authority is taken in by developers’ TAs then wholly unsuitable developments will be permitted.

**Introduction:**

The spatial development strategy (paragraph 4.6.20 and Policy S2) does not address the development needs of the borough ensuring distances are practical; this is certainly not the case with all the development sites. For example, the Wisley airfield site will generate a massive increase in vehicle journeys; developments in West Horsley will lead to greater car use, as will the proposed developments at Garlick’s Arch and in Send. The obvious site choice for sustainable development would be on brownfield sites in the town but the Local Plan proposes allocating those sites to the declining retail industry instead.

Paragraph 4.6.21 suggests that sustainable transport is promoted. Far from providing sustainable transport this Plan will generate a massive increase in motor vehicle journeys. The Plan cannot force residents to ride bicycles or walk everywhere.

**Justification:**

Paragraph 4.6.22 seeks to set out a reasoned justification and alleges that development should offer real travel choice by sustainable transport modes. There is little sign that this is being taken seriously enough now.

Paragraph 4.6.23 proposed to bring forward a Vehicle Parking Supplementary Planning Document. It is not clear what to make of this. Failure to provide off-street vehicle parking will not prevent residents owning cars and finding somewhere else to park but it may make life difficult for key workers to commute to their place of work. How can a consultation take place relying on non-existent background documents which are key parts of the Evidence Base? How can anyone comment on non-existent documents, and even if brought forward part-way through the consultation, any comments will be prejudiced by the absence of this informing the start of the consultation.

Paragraph 4.6.24 refers to the Sustainable Movement Corridor. Bus services are aspirational but economic reality may mean that they fail to persist. There is not enough detail published on how the SMC will be delivered – suggesting that it is aspirational rather than fully thought through.
Paragraph 4.6.26 refers to reviewing existing transport facilities and likely transport generation as part of assessing the amount of incremental travel demand. That consideration should have taken place in a robust and detailed manner on a site-by-site basis before the sites were allocated in the Local Plan. It is not sufficient to leave that until the planning application stage as intended by GBC and SCC, given that all sites will be subject to “permission in principle” under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and so will not be capable of subsequent rejection on these grounds.

Paragraph 4.6.27 notes that Development must mitigate its transport impacts. The measures described rely entirely on people taking them up and not dumping their travel information packs in the nearest bin. It is clear that GBC, in response to concerns about elderly and disabled people failing to be coerced into riding bicycles are now suggesting tricycles to overcome this obstacle to their aspirations. They should be aware that while tricycles may help with balance issues they are heavier and harder to ride uphill. While the policy (unusually) notes that mitigation must be provided, in fact this is then diluted to suggest that facilities for electric car charging points and encouragement to car-share can be sufficient; all are optional and therefore meaningless.

However well designed a development is it will make matters worse during construction and if on a greenfield site, it is hard to see how it will achieve environmental benefits. On the other hand, replacing inefficient buildings on a brownfield site could lead to benefits in the long term.

Paragraph 4.6.28 notes “Developers should have regard” to the “Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C”. The only thing that developers have regard for is forcing their application through and maximising their profit – that is the business they are in. Appendix C is lacking in detail. It notes, for example that there will be new town centre bus facilities at a cost of £5-10 million – such vagueness make it clear that no real costing or analysis of proposals has been prepared, and that the Infrastructure improvements proposed have not been properly considered. Having regard to fluid and uncertain proposals is effectively meaningless as a constraint or a requirement.

Paragraph 4.6.29 requires that applications need to address the transport implications of the proposed development. Experience with recent planning applications suggests that developers will do everything in their power to understate transport impacts and we have no faith in GBC and SCC taking a sufficiently robust line on this.

Key Evidence is missing or inadequate.

The Strategic Transport Assessment (SCC 2016) is listed as “forthcoming”, but this plan has been produced in the absence of any strategic transport review.

There are further inadequacies in the Evidence Base, highlighted in the following annexes, which include examples of deficiencies, ambiguities and inadequacies in the transport and infrastructure evidence. This is not a comprehensive list of deficiencies, but serves as an illustration of the poor evidence on which decisions have been based.

**Annexe 1**

Comments on Guildford Borough Transport Study 2016

Page 2 – “address the historic infrastructure deficit” - developers are not required to do this?

Page 2 – It is wrong to claim that the cycle infrastructure along the A25 is good – and many cyclists are not careful, so putting them in contention with pedestrians is not a good idea.

Page 5 – The decision on Heathrow or Gatwick has yet to be taken but airport expansion in the south-east cannot be regarded as sustainable development and, although GBC has no control over such external decisions, its own growth agenda will drive a need for that expansion.

Page 6 An additional weakness is alternative “road closure diversion” routes for the SRN on the LRN

Page 6 Are the “Committed Improvements” actually committed and guaranteed to be delivered?

Page 7 The rail strategy does not provide for Wisley (residents would drive to stations)
How long will it take to deliver Crossrail 2? “We hope that Crossrail 2 could be operational by 2030, but we are in the very early stages of planning and no decision to build it has been made.”

Guildford platform capacity still many years away if ever.

The rail strategy anticipates many improvements that have not been secured and may have unintended consequences if they proceed (see above).

The Southern Rail Access to Heathrow (see the feasibility study dated December 2015 – although other proposals may be put forward (e.g.by Hounslow)) is still in its early stages and would have significant impacts on open space beyond our Borough. For example, all options in the feasibility study would use Staines Moor SSSI and Option 4 would use Bedfont Lakes Country Park (a Local Nature Reserve and SNCI).

The various options would use existing commercial, residential and highways land in varying degrees. It seems unlikely that a solution will be delivered within the Plan period and removal of highly valued open space with high biodiversity (wherever it is in South-east England) cannot be regarded as sustainable.

There is a stark contrast between the plans for the town centre which involve encouraging a reduction in traffic by reducing roadspace and the plans for the SRN and parts of the LRN which involve increasing capacity. While increasing capacity may reduce some areas of congestion in the short term, history suggests that traffic will rapidly grow until the improved roads are congested once again. This can hardly be regarded as sustainable. A sustainable option would be to apply a very substantial traffic infrastructure constraint on the housing number.

While the A3 Guildford Tunnel aspiration has some environmental advantages over widening (in particular for residents living close to the A3), the environmental burden of the construction phase will be far higher and aspects such as location of ventilation stacks and their local effect (in all weather conditions) do not appear to have been considered.

Under Weaknesses the point about A roads in Guildford Town also applies to surrounding areas in the Borough and beyond. The anticipated improvements ignore existing congestion to the south and east of Guildford – presumably because SCC’s transport assessment methodology only identifies the tip of the iceberg. The current Plan will see increased congestion and a resultant reduction in air quality in many areas beyond the town centre.

“Largely commercial bus services” is seen as a strength whereas it should be seen as a weakness with a trend to reduced subsidies and the provision of bus services, especially in rural areas, being increasingly dependent on commercial gain. It is difficult to see this changing under the current Government cuts philosophy. The point “Subject to business case including funding” under Aspirations demonstrates this point.

We welcome the aspiration to “Expand the public realm through significantly extended pedestrian-priority areas”.

Guildford is well behind other areas in monitoring air quality let alone attempting to reduce it.

The introduction talks about reductions in some pollutants. This may be the case for pollutants such as Sulphur Dioxide, which contributed to the visible London smogs, but it is not true of diesel vehicle emissions which have increased as a result of Government policy including its aggressive growth agenda and population increase through immigration.

30 accessible electric vehicle charging points are only an aspiration and will be nowhere near enough if there is a real shift to electric vehicles.

It is clear from the “Strategy outcomes” that GBC would prefer not to follow other areas in pro-actively tackling air quality.

The timescales indicate that the main rail improvements (Including the two new stations) are unlikely to be delivered until the end of the Plan period or even later. The sites that are supposedly justified by their inclusion will generate a major increase in road traffic in the interim and it may be more difficult to achieve this aspect of modal shift in the longer term. The same can be said about the other traffic infrastructure proposals. Residential development is being scheduled before the infrastructure that it will need.
Page 24 Monitoring – “Increase” needs to be in proportion to population growth as otherwise failure will be taken as success. “An Increase in average vehicle speeds” is inconsistent with the desire to reduce the number of persons killed or seriously injured. For example, some A roads pass through residential areas where pedestrians, including schoolchildren, are trying to cross the road at peak times. It is noted that increase in vehicle speeds is only desired in the morning. Going home from work does not seem to matter!

Annexe 2

GTAMS

NPPF and NPPG The Plan ignores the points concerning Green Belt and protecting the environment. GBC have tried to get round this by spinning their messages and using misleading statistics including a major understatement of the area of Green Belt to be removed.

Planning Update (March 2015) – The point in this update concerning Green Belt has been ignored

Monitoring Indicators:

Ten years is far too long to wait for information on whether the approach is working or not. The target requires only an increase. This would permit an increase less than that in line with any population growth to be regarded as success. The bar has been set well within the failure range.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2237  Respondent: 8860897 / Julia Shaw  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the concept and aim but OBJECT on the grounds that the practicalities of sustainable transport have not been properly considered, it is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable. Not everyone can cycle all the time.

How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process - the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle – and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?

The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a hopa bus can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.

While I welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations there could be unintended consequences.

Once again I see the word “expect” used which means the policy has no teeth. The word “expect” must be replaced with the word “require” so that this policy is enforceable.

There are a number of problems with this policy.

Congestion is a widely recognised factor in the local area of Guildford, and this is a major factor in the public response to the proposed housing numbers, which represents more than a 25% increase in housing numbers in a borough that is already profoundly congested. [Source: SHMA p61: itself sourced from ONS for 2013.] Residents recognise that to increase the population by this level within the existing transport provision is not feasible, and this informs much of the public response to the proposed level of housing accommodation.

It is not clear that this recognition, which is widespread through the borough, is shared by those who have drafted the Local Plan.

Guildford is a commuter town, which (compared to London) offers better quality of life and lower house prices, so it will continue to be a commuter town for the foreseeable future. As a result, access to the stations for commuting is of significance. It is not realistic to assume that traffic to stations for commuters can be replaced either by bus services (slow, intermittent, expensive, and in many cases absent completely) or by cycle. There is a capacity issue of car parking at the station, which effectively creates an absolute constraint on the feasibility of commuting from Guildford.

Cycling is attractive, and, for the urban young, especially students, it is both practical and cheap, and can be quick. However, as noted, those en route to work cannot be assumed to be able to cycle in working clothes. Elderly members of the community, those transporting small children, and the disabled cannot participate in cycling except to a limited extent. Effectively the "average" person deemed to be capable of cycling to substitute for car trips is an able-bodied adult not.
travelling to somewhere where smart clothing is required, not needing to arrive clean (or with showering facilities on arrival, not provided by all employers); this is not sufficiently widespread in terms of the local demographic for travellers that it should be allowed to determine policy – and of course, not needing to transport, for example, supermarket shopping after the trip. What about the disabled? the elderly? those looking after more than one child? Are they to be housebound? This is not a reasonable strategy. Before transport and buildings are determined on the basis of such a policy, it is also imperative that safe cycle routes are implemented through the borough. Cycling in winter on rural roads is inherently more dangerous. Upgrading these roads would not be feasible in terms of cost nor desirable in terms of local character.

Cycle lanes which disappear into normal traffic lanes, which travel over potholes and which allow cyclists to be threatened by HGVs are not conducive to wider cycle usage, nor should wider cycle usage be encouraged until it can be demonstrated that it is safe, which currently, locally, it is not. The A25 cycle corridor scheme (Part of LRN1) will exchange the risk between cyclists and vehicles sharing space for the risk between cyclists and pedestrians sharing space. Much of the A25 has no pedestrian area anyway outside the urban space. Many cyclists travel at high speed and they will be put into conflict with pedestrians including mothers with very young children and schoolchildren many of whom need to cross the road and hence cross the cycleway. This is likely to lead to accidents and pedestrians are being disadvantaged.

Road capacity reduces as average speeds come down due to congestion. Where proper cycle lanes or off-road lanes are not provided then it is inevitable that safe driving will lead to reduced average motor vehicle speeds and gap development in the traffic stream. Both these effects act to reduce the capacity of our local road network. This loss of capacity has not been recognised in the Transport Strategy.

The concept of the park and ride with access into the town limited for those who live outside the town, is similarly flawed. Park and Ride is expensive, cumbersome and slow. It should be noted that in Oxford it has had a disastrous impact on small local retailers which is a retail segment that it is important to retain and support.

Use of park and rides increases the use of the strategic road network by local users, which is not what it is designed to do.

This proposal is combined with aggressive exclusion from the town of those who are living in peripheral communities, which will increasingly resemble housing estates. This is a strategy for sink estates through Surrey instead of the Green Belt - this is not a strategy for growth. Head offices will choose to go elsewhere, because highly skilled staff and management in the cutting edge industries that GBC wants to encourage, will not choose to live in a dense housing estate.

The existing extent of traffic congestion has not been fully recognised. As a consequence the impact of the various development scenarios has been understated and the infrastructure costs are an understatement.

The transport studies are incomplete and unpublished and this should have led to deferral of consideration of the Local Plan consultation process until it was possible to revise the plan post publication of the studies. This matter was raised by a number of councillors at the Full Council meeting on 24 May 2016 when the consultation was approved, but a motion to defer was overturned by the majority party.

Cross-subsidy in terms of infrastructure is envisaged. The infrastructure deficit needs to be resolved before there are large numbers of new residents exacerbating the current congestion. The funding of the new developments through CIL and S 106 is expected to contribute to the transport impacts across the borough, and there is negligible concern for the transport problems created within those new developments or in areas adjacent to them. This is not acceptable to existing residents and is likely to cause some problems with the future residents too, who may arguably feel aggrieved that the road funding associated with their developments is being subverted to other areas. While this may be permissible under the revised CIL regulations it is questionable whether it is morally acceptable to grant planning permission to build on the Green Belt in order to cross subsidise the building of roads or other infrastructure in the town centre or elsewhere across the borough or outside it.

Insetting of villages and the proposed relaxation of planning restrictions anywhere outside settlements (Green Belt or not), implied in P2, will lead to substantial infilling that will not require traffic assessment but will contribute a highly significant amount of additional car journeys overall - by a more insidious process than the large developments proposed.
Costs for rail or bus travel could be substantially reduced and would incentivise their use; but these are outside the remit of GBC and so cannot be encouraged by them.

It remains to be seen whether the proposed new stations will be delivered as they are not entirely within the council’s control. While I welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations there could be unintended consequences as the roads local to both sites are heavily congested. If parking facilities are inadequate this could lead to a need for onerous parking restrictions on roads nearby – possibly affecting small businesses adversely.

If parking facilities are adequate this will encourage more traffic onto local roads. House prices near to stations tend to attract higher prices and this will increase the profit motive to developers wanting to build on greenfield sites nearby. It will also mean that so-called affordable housing will be even less affordable at these sites. It may also lead, over time, to an undesirable loss of social-rented housing in the vicinity. A minor issue is that stopping at the additional stations will increase the train journey times to and from Guildford town centre on the lines affected.

**Detail in Policy wording – flawed drafting:**

The policy begins and ends with the weak and totally ineffective word, in planning terms, “expect”.

Contributing through CIL will not necessarily address needs local to the development concerned, and created by it, but may involve solving existing problems elsewhere in the Borough.

Bullets 4 & 5 – improvements to park and ride facilities imply increased car usage from outside the town and the parking provision acknowledges that most journeys will be by car.

Bullet 6 - Has the Vehicle parking Supplementary Planning Document been published? It is not listed as key evidence but the policy refers. How can a policy have been determined with reference to a non-existent part of the evidence base?

Bullets 7,8, 9 & 10 are weak & aspirational with let-out words such as “facilitate the use of”, “wherever possible”, “contribute” and “where appropriate” (and poorly bulleted!). How will the use of ultra low emission vehicles be facilitated? This is such a vague aspiration as to be meaningless.

The policy only “expects” new developments to contribute, demonstrate adequate provision, etc – it should enforce them. A transport statement AND assessment ought to be a fixed requirement – not a matter for negotiation – while the policy implies that this might be waived even for sites that generate significant amounts of movement.

The construction traffic, noise and pollution generated by meeting the proposed housing number will be excessive. It will have a highly significant impact on the amenity and health of those residents living close to the development sites and those who live on the routes that will be taken by the construction traffic.

The last paragraph says nothing new in planning terms but does mean that the Local Plan has not fully and properly considered the traffic impacts of the proposed sites. We have experience of how misleading the TAs produced by developers can be – using averaging techniques and understated baseline figures, days when schools are not operating and many other devices to pull the wool over the eyes of planning authorities. This aspect is a denial of responsibility by GBC. The result is that Green Belt and countryside will be released for development when fuller consideration of traffic impacts at the Local Plan stage should have prevented that. If the planning authority is taken in by developers’ TAs then wholly unsuitable developments will be permitted.

**Introduction:**

The spatial development strategy (paragraph 4.6.20 and Policy S2) does not address the development needs of the borough ensuring distances are practical; this is certainly not the case with all the development sites. For example, the Wisley airfield site will generate a massive increase in vehicle journeys; developments in West Horsley will lead to greater car use, as will the proposed developments at Garlick’s Arch and in Send. The obvious site choice for sustainable development would be on brownfield sites in the town but the Local Plan proposes allocating those sites to the declining retail industry instead.
Paragraph 4.6.21 suggests that sustainable transport is promoted. Far from providing sustainable transport this Plan will generate a massive increase in motor vehicle journeys. The Plan cannot force residents to ride bicycles or walk everywhere.

Justification:

Paragraph 4.6.22 seeks to set out a reasoned justification and alleges that development should offer real travel choice by sustainable transport modes. There is little sign that this is being taken seriously enough now.

Paragraph 4.6.23 proposed to bring forward a Vehicle Parking Supplementary Planning Document. It is not clear what to make of this. Failure to provide off-street vehicle parking will not prevent residents owning cars and finding somewhere else to park but it may make life difficult for key workers to commute to their place of work. How can a consultation take place relying on non-existent background documents which are key parts of the Evidence Base? How can anyone comment on non-existent documents, and even if brought forward part-way through the consultation, any comments will be prejudiced by the absence of this informing the start of the consultation.

Paragraph 4.6.24 refers to the Sustainable Movement Corridor. Bus services are aspirational but economic reality may mean that they fail to persist. There is not enough detail published on how the SMC will be delivered – suggesting that it is aspirational rather than fully thought through.

Paragraph 4.6.26 refers to reviewing existing transport facilities and likely transport generation as part of assessing the amount of incremental travel demand. That consideration should have taken place in a robust and detailed manner on a site-by-site basis before the sites were allocated in the Local Plan. It is not sufficient to leave that until the planning application stage as intended by GBC and SCC, given that all sites will be subject to “permission in principle” under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and so will not be capable of subsequent rejection on these grounds.

Paragraph 4.6.27 notes that Development must mitigate its transport impacts. The measures described rely entirely on people taking them up and not dumping their travel information packs in the nearest bin. It is clear that GBC, in response to concerns about elderly and disabled people failing to be coerced into riding bicycles are now suggesting tricycles to overcome this obstacle to their aspirations. They should be aware that while tricycles may help with balance issues they are heavier and harder to ride uphill. While the policy (unusually) notes that mitigation must be provided, in fact this is then diluted to suggest that facilities for electric car charging points and encouragement to car-share can be sufficient; all are optional and therefore meaningless.

However well designed a development is it will make matters worse during construction and if on a greenfield site, it is hard to see how it will achieve environmental benefits. On the other hand, replacing inefficient buildings on a brownfield site could lead to benefits in the long term.

Paragraph 4.6.28 notes “Developers should have regard” to the “Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C”. The only thing that developers have regard for is forcing their application through and maximising their profit – that is the business they are in. Appendix C is lacking in detail. It notes, for example that there will be new town centre bus facilities at a cost of £5-10 million – such vagueness make it clear that no real costing or analysis of proposals has been prepared, and that the Infrastructure improvements proposed have not been properly considered. Having regard to fluid and uncertain proposals is effectively meaningless as a constraint or a requirement.

Paragraph 4.6.29 requires that applications need to address the transport implications of the proposed development. Experience with recent planning applications suggests that developers will do everything in their power to understate transport impacts and I have no faith in GBC and SCC taking a sufficiently robust line on this.

Key Evidence is missing or inadequate.

The Strategic Transport Assessment (SCC 2016) is listed as “forthcoming”, but this plan has been produced in the absence of any strategic transport review.
There are further inadequacies in the Evidence Base, highlighted in the following annexes, which include examples of deficiencies, ambiguities and inadequacies in the transport and infrastructure evidence. This is not a comprehensive list of deficiencies, but serves as an illustration of the poor evidence on which decisions have been based.

Annexe 1

Comments on Guildford Borough Transport Study 2016

Page 2 – “address the historic infrastructure deficit” - developers are not required to do this?

Page 2 – It is wrong to claim that the cycle infrastructure along the A25 is good – and many cyclists are not careful, so putting them in contention with pedestrians is not a good idea.

Page 5 – The decision on Heathrow or Gatwick has yet to be taken but airport expansion in the south-east cannot be regarded as sustainable development and, although GBC has no control over such external decisions, its own growth agenda will drive a need for that expansion.

Page 6 An additional weakness is alternative “road closure diversion” routes for the SRN on the LRN

Page 6 Are the “Committed Improvements” actually committed and guaranteed to be delivered?

Page 7 The rail strategy does not provide for Wisley (residents would drive to stations)

Page 7 How long will it take to deliver Crossrail 2? “We hope that Crossrail 2 could be operational by 2030, but we are in the very early stages of planning and no decision to build it has been made.”

Page 7 Guildford platform capacity still many years away if ever.

Page 7 The rail strategy anticipates many improvements that have not been secured and may have unintended consequences if they proceed (see above)

Page 7 The Southern Rail Access to Heathrow [see the feasibility study dated December 2015 – although other proposals may be put forward (e.g.by Hounslow)] is still in its early stages and would have significant impacts on open space beyond our Borough. For example, all options in the feasibility study would use Staines Moor SSSI and Option 4 would use Bedfont Lakes Country Park (a Local Nature Reserve and SNCI).

The various options would use existing commercial, residential and highways land in varying degrees. It seems unlikely that a solution will be delivered within the Plan period and removal of highly valued open space with high biodiversity (wherever it is in South-east England) cannot be regarded as sustainable.

Page 10 and 13 There is a stark contrast between the plans for the town centre which involve encouraging a reduction in traffic by reducing roadspace and the plans for the SRN and parts of the LRN which involve increasing capacity. While increasing capacity may reduce some areas of congestion in the short term, history suggests that traffic will rapidly grow until the improved roads are congested once again. This can hardly be regarded as sustainable. A sustainable option would be to apply a very substantial traffic infrastructure constraint on the housing number.

Page 10 While the A3 Guildford Tunnel aspiration has some environmental advantages over widening (in particular for residents living close to the A3), the environmental burden of the construction phase will be far higher and aspects such as location of ventilation stacks and their local effect (in all weather conditions) do not appear to have been considered.

Page 14 Under Weaknesses the point about A roads in Guildford Town also applies to surrounding areas in the Borough and beyond. The anticipated improvements ignore existing congestion to the south and east of Guildford – presumably because SCC’s transport assessment methodology only identifies the tip of the iceberg. The current Plan will see increased congestion and a resultant reduction in air quality in many areas beyond the town centre.

Page 16 “Largely commercial bus services” is seen as a strength whereas it should be seen as a weakness with a trend to reduced subsidies and the provision of bus services, especially in rural areas, being increasingly dependent on commercial
gain. It is difficult to see this changing under the current Government cuts philosophy. The point “Subject to business case including funding” under Aspirations demonstrates this point.

Page 18 I welcome the aspiration to “Expand the public realm through significantly extended pedestrian-priority areas”

Page 19 Guildford is well behind other areas in monitoring air quality let alone attempting to reduce it.

The introduction talks about reductions in some pollutants. This may be the case for pollutants such as Sulphur Dioxide, which contributed to the visible London smogs, but it is not true of diesel vehicle emissions which have increased as a result of Government policy including its aggressive growth agenda and population increase through immigration.

30 accessible electric vehicle charging points are only an aspiration and will be nowhere near enough if there is a real shift to electric vehicles.

It is clear from the “Strategy outcomes” that GBC would prefer not to follow other areas in pro-actively tackling air quality.

Page 22/23/24 The timescales indicate that the main rail improvements (Including the two new stations) are unlikely to be delivered until the end of the Plan period or even later. The sites that are supposedly justified by their inclusion will generate a major increase in road traffic in the interim and it may be more difficult to achieve this aspect of modal shift in the longer term. The same can be said about the other traffic infrastructure proposals. Residential development is being scheduled before the infrastructure that it will need.

Page 24 Monitoring – “Increase” needs to be in proportion to population growth as otherwise failure will taken as success. “An Increase in average vehicle speeds” is inconsistent with the desire to reduce the number of persons killed or seriously injured. For example, some A roads pass through residential areas where pedestrians, including schoolchildren, are trying to cross the road at peak times. It is noted that increase in vehicle speeds is only desired in the morning. Going home from work does not seem to matter!

Annexe 2

GTAMS

NPPF and NPPG The Plan ignores the points concerning Green Belt and protecting the environment. GBC have tried to get round this by spinning their messages and using misleading statistics including a major understatement of the area of Green Belt to be removed.

Planning Update (March 2015) – The point in this update concerning Green Belt has been ignored

Monitoring Indicators:

Ten years is far too long to wait for information on whether the approach is working or not. The target requires only an increase. This would permit an increase less than that in line with any population growth to be regarded as success. The bar has been set well within the failure range.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1132  Respondent: 8860897 / Julia Shaw  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )
Item 4.6.20 makes a statement that is clearly at odds with the choice of sites which will generate a major increase in private motor vehicle journeys. For example, the Lead Councillor for the Local Plan seems to be alone in believing that a sustainable plan for Wisley Airfield will be found.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4214  **Respondent:** 8862337 / Peter Craggs  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This land contributes hugely to the open character of the village and provides an attractive setting for the village's community facilities.

Any housing development on this elevated site would impact negatively on the attractiveness of the village and surrounding area. Access to this site would be on Chinthurst Lane. This road is already heavily congested with 'rat run' and local traffic and is not capable of absorbing further vehicles. The road is without pavements in places and is already a serious health risk to pedestrians, including older people and young children. Worsen this situation and the dangers will increase significantly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11376  **Respondent:** 8865537 / P Waldner  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14850  **Respondent:** 8865985 / Grant Ringshaw  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states: “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8387  Respondent: 8878241 / Janet O'Hara  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Transport and Roads:

• Many of the traffic routes in and around the Horsleys are only lanes, often with pavements on one side of the carriageway. The roads are already busy, with queues at rush hour and the state of potholes on most roads is atrocious. Considering many households now have two cars, the potential increase in traffic from so many proposed new homes would overwhelm the existing infrastructure and lead to serious, and potentially life threatening, safety concerns.

• Car parking at Horsley railway station is already limited and usually full during the working week. There is no adjacent land available for additional car parking provision. A significant increase in the villages’ population will increase pressure on station car parking and increase traffic movements to and from the station, which already has a terribly dangerous intersection at its access junction. There is little or no scope for improvement to this situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15885  Respondent: 8878337 / J.R Lukey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My garden backs onto the A323 and the road and general area is chocked with traffic already. I and some of my neighbours are suffering from C.O.P.D.

"This kind of extra traffic and associated pollution would bring with it health hazards" as stated by the BBC report (Road pollution is more than twice as deadly as traffic accidents, according to a study of UK air quality) The Royal Surrey Hospital is working to capacity already and is £11m in debt. The state of some of the local roads needs addressing before considering a larger population in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to plan from a traffic and parking perspective.

Most of the new houses will have at least 2 cars, which means 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The roads and major junctions already have considerably heavy traffic at peak times and cannot cope with more. Sometimes it takes 15 minutes to queue and then get onto the Epsom Road from Ockham Road by the Duke of Wellington. Parking is already very tricky at times in the village, as it is at the railway stations and medical centre.

I object to the plans from a commuting perspective.

Trains to London at peak times are already at capacity. They simply cannot take any more people. More commuters will mean misery for us on daily basis.

I object to the plan due to the impact upon the local Road Network.

In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burmington to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of three routes accessing the A3 at Burmington in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost certainly true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object.

I have serious concerns about declining air quality

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits rendering it unsuitable to locate a new school in this area as proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I have serious concerns about declining air quality

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits rendering it unsuitable to locate a new school in this area as proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11588  Respondent: 8881537 / Jean Baptist  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2704  Respondent: 8881665 / Mike Forster  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In particular further expansion of the out-dated Friary shopping centre that will only attract increased traffic within the town centre which is already often unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3550  Respondent: 8881825 / Siobhan Collins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of planned road infrastructure. The A3 and the village roads around Horsley are already congested. Many of the roads in Horsley are narrow, without pavements for pedestrians. To add more vehicles into the mix would be dangerous and would have a damaging effect on the character of our rural areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3332</th>
<th>Respondent: 8883489 / N &amp; B Hinchliff</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is brownfield land available in the town centre which is being earmarked for commercial development rather than for housing. This is sufficient to meet our real needs for affordable local homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are enough vacant commercial sites to cope with genuine business need and we have enough retail capacity already. The argument for urban brownfield/derelict land being used for housing is clear, extremely compelling and, I’m sure, would meet with widespread approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would therefore ask you revise the housing number and amend the Local Plan to utilise brownfield land rather than green field sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5755</th>
<th>Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Roads and infrastructure. There is a regular service on trains to and from London and Guildford from Horsley station. Parking at the station car park is becoming an increasing problem for both commuters and later travellers. There would be an increase in traffic movements from West Horsley to the station for dropping off and collecting passengers. This is particularly noticeable at school times and for commuters.

There would also be a large increase in car usage on already busy roads as for each new house there is often another 1 or 2 cars using the roads.

To summarise, the facilities and infrastructure of West Horsley cannot support anything like the scale of development which is proposed. There appear to be no plans to expand the infrastructure before new homes are built.

I hope these comments are of assistance in your deliberations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
9. I OBJECT to the proposed developments around Ripley and Send due to the concerns over 'Poor Air Quality' which is already identified as high within Ripley village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3666</th>
<th>Respondent: 8890465 / Saskia Horst</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The weight of traffic has increased with an alarming rate, not only due to many newly built houses (infill) but also due to Satellite Navigation systems sending traffic from the A246 through East Horsley to the A3 and A246. The roads are barely wide enough to accommodate the heavy load of lorries, coaches, large 4x4s and other traffic. There is nowhere to park in the village as the carpark behind the shops fills up very rapidly these days. So THE HORSLEYS ARE FULL.

I therefore strongly object to the horrifying idea of building any more houses in or around the Horsleys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4219</th>
<th>Respondent: 8890657 / David Weight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. West Horsley village is not capable of supporting the proposed increase in Already the local infrastructure, amenities and services can be overwhelmed with traffic and some are in particularly high demand such as the Medical Health Centre, schools, railway parking and shopping parking. Parking at East Horsley station is already a major issue (personal experience has shown that often, when taking a mid-morning train, the car park is virtually full and on more than one occasion I have taken the last space - whilst more people were seeking to park). In rush hour the trains themselves are running at a high capacity even by the time they arrive at Horsley station, with the limited number of faster trains being particularly full- the proposed additional housing will create serious capacity issues for rail transport. This doesn't seem to have been taken into account. Road transport is a poor alternative choice given the capacity challenges already experienced in the area. Access to the local Medical Surgery, Village Hall and sports facilities are equally constrained. The local West Horsley village store may close this year as the owner wishes to retire which will place even greater strain on the other local shops. The same can be said for utilisation of the local shopping parades should the village population be expanded in such a dramatic fashion. In short, there are serious capacity issues that are not addressed in The Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10783</th>
<th>Respondent: 8891937 / Micheal Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The plan says little about the infrastructure which would be needed to support over 500 new homes, increasing the number of homes in West Horsley by over 50% - not to mention the 2000 proposed for the nearby Wisley Airfield site. However we fear great changes - and problems - in several areas, including:-

1. Traffic and Communications

The roads in the village are scarcely adequate for the present traffic. Some would need to be widened, there would be a need for traffic islands and roundabouts in some places, street lighting would have to be installed, extra parking areas would be needed in the village, and all this would adversely affect our rural environment.

Furthermore, many new residents would want to commute from Horsley station and park their cars there. The parking area at the station is already inadequate, and if 50% or more extra cars are using it, where will you find space for them?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4593  Respondent: 8892673 / Nick Forwood  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

As a local resident, with a young family I am acutely concerned, with air quality and the levels of harmful motor transport emissions. Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” As this development, is within 400m from my house, I ask GBC to detail how they achieve this? This proposed development, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, and emissions as traffic will mount up waiting for the lights to change. This will be particularly acute to nearby properties such as mine. This will have a detrimental health effect to my children when they play in their garden.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9313  Respondent: 8892737 / David Eagle  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16985  Respondent: 8893057 / Dianne Garnett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1 We object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments

1.2 This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

1.3 The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

1.4 The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

1.5 The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day, as I used to do. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

1.6 Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town. 1.7 Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

1.8 The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The JWRA support the additions that state that any new developments must take into account the impact on air quality, noise and the environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

You need to visit Horsley Station at 9.30am Monday to Friday and take a look at the Station car park.

Since the extension of the platform there are even more people using Horsley Station to commute. It is at capacity now.

You only have to look at this one example to realise that more housing will cripple Horsley from an infrastructure perspective.

It is incredibly short sighted to think that available land = great place to build houses. The actual building of the houses is only part of the consideration. You have to think about everything else that housing impacts.

The station car park is a visible example of how full this area is now. Think about schools, medical facilities and drainage. This area cannot handle the growth that is planned.

The proposal to remove the Horsleys from the Green Belt has not been properly investigated. The extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of the Horsleys seems to be only to increase land available for future developments.

The development of over 2000 house village at the former Wisley Airfield, only 2 miles away surely cannot make any sense either. The impact on the Horsleys for all the previously documented reasons would be enormous.

Please close your eyes for 1 minute and stop to think about this very carefully.

The Horsleys cannot accommodate such a plan. It will not work.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  
- image (5).jpeg (134 KB)
- image (4).jpeg (139 KB)
11. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14761  Respondent: 8896161 / Carol Wilson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments

I OBJECT to this policy to the extent that it has a detrimental impact on the existing Green Belt.

I also OBJECT to this policy as it does not include, but should include, compulsory cycle lanes separated from the roads on all new developments.

I also OBJECT to this policy as it is too weak in saying only that developers “will be expected to” propose and secure travel Plans for their developments and contribute to transport arrangements for the able and disabled. This proposed policy needs to be made more robust and properly tie down developers and major housebuilding companies.

If new towns such as Wisley are built, then there will be insufficient employment locally and the car will be the only mode of transport available for commuters. The roads would grind to a halt.

The bicycle is good in theory but unlikely in reality for many. Most cyclists are recreational cyclists. Others are too old, too young, have too much to carry, do not want to arrive sweaty.

I object to the proposals to inset 14 village from the Green Belt and to change settlement boundaries. Land can only be removed from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. Housing is not a special circumstance.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13453  Respondent: 8897857 / Helen Lewis  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Furthermore, I object strongly to the proposed Site allocation A35 (Wisley Airfield site). Although GBC proposes new infrastructure here, it takes no account of the already overburdened rail link into London – the plan talks about laying on adequate public transport to Horsley and Effingham stations, but this commuter line already suffers from severe overcrowding – indeed South West trains haven’t been able to cope despite adding extra coaches to their trains. Parking at the stations is already to capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Local Infrastructure

My view is that the local infrastructure is already overloaded.

Road Network

Junctions are often totally gridlocked at peak times (I am particularly affected by the junction of the A246 and Ockham Road South, the junction of Effingham Common Road and Forest Road, and the A3 junction at Ockham/Ripley). The number of new houses proposed will result in a significant increase in traffic volume which cannot possibly be absorbed. The condition of the roads is also an issue. Many are in a constant state of repair and the drains are unable to cope with rain.

Parking

The station car park at Horsley station is already at maximum capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. Air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that: “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. Recent tests conducted have reported that Ripley High Street is already at dangerous levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/4118  Respondent: 8901633 / Duncan Gray  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**11. POLICY I3**

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/1626  Respondent: 8901729 / Justin Underwood  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

At The train station the car park is already full quite often, where would the extra commuters park? Potentially 1200 extra cars in the village? No way

The drains on Ockham road north often get blocked, and back up, there are major problems and another 604 homes in the villages will lead to major problems. The drains have a lot of broken bricks in them I have heard and cannot take any more capacity

All the Traffic stopping at glenesk school is a proven bottleneck in the morning, The private schools already generate far too much additional traffic through the village first thing and last thing, building all these extra homes will make it gridlock in the mornings and afternoons

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/8169  Respondent: 8902465 / Linda Slater  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):
• Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
• Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
• Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. I.e. most residents!
• Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16950  Respondent: 8902689 / Lyndell Mussell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

TRAFFIC CONGESTION

Traffic in west Guildford is very congested, particularly in early morning and evening. It is more convenient to walk to the town centre than use a car in this period.

Infrastructure could very much improved in the town with a bus and train interchange at Guildford station to assist commuters coming into and out of the town. In addition, new stations at Park Barn (for the RSCH Hospital), at Bellfields and Shalford could ease congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18528  Respondent: 8903265 / Susan Anderson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15042  Respondent: 8904129 / Elizabeth Ross  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Document:</strong></th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPP16/1461 <strong>Respondent:</strong> 8904161 / Geoffrey &amp; Lesley Tregaskes <strong>Agent:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety these housing proposals will bring to this area, with its narrow rural roads, few pavements, almost nonexistent street lighting - country lanes used regularly by sports cyclists and horseriders. The increased traffic, let alone increase in HGV traffic, will exacerbate the dangers to cyclists, pedestrians and horseriders, and to road traffic generally as the roads are not wide enough to allow two large vehicles to pass in places.

I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the significant infrastructure enhancements that would be needed to the major roads, A3 and M25, as well as rail stations at Effingham Junction and Horsley which cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and whose car parks are already used to capacity.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> PSLPP16/4193 <strong>Respondent:</strong> 8904673 / Colin Burnside <strong>Agent:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **POLICY I3**

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15078  **Respondent:** 8905537 / Christopher Ross  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3676  **Respondent:** 8906177 / Peter & Robyn Cormack  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object that housing on the Green Belt will increase traffic through our already overcrowded village roads. In particular I bring to your attention the A247 through West Clandon. I suggest to you that a site visit here has not been made. If it had, it would become patently obvious that although the road might be designated an “A” road, it is totally inadequate to carry the through traffic which uses it now. It is considerably narrower than “A” road specifications and is dangerously lacking in adequate pavements, none of which can be easily rectified.

Never has it been more necessary to protect and conserve our precious Green Belt, for this century and beyond, for future generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9645  **Respondent:** 8906305 / Anne Fort  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8624  Respondent: 8907137 / Jennifer A. Milligan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re: I object to the GBC Proposed Local Plan (June 2016)

I would like to register my STRONG objection to the draft local plan for the following reasons:

I object the Proposed Local Plan that relates to the Ripley/Ockham area because of the impact it will have on our roads. I live in Ripley and the A.3 is regularly at a stand-still in the mornings due to the large amount of traffic queuing to get on to the M.25 at the Wisley intersection. Any problem on the A.3 and traffic comes through Ripley. The inclusion of the former Wisley Airfield as a potential site for over 2,000 houses could not be contemplated without improved infrastructure improvements. If in the fullness of time the A3 and M25 are upgraded somehow to cope with the extra traffic, how will Ockham Road North, Ockham Lane and Old Lane and Ripley High Street cope with the extra cars trying to get to the local railway stations, shops, schools etc? The station car parks are always full, it is too dangerous to cycle. This is compounded with the inclusion of Garlick’s Arch (A43) in the Local Plan and Gosden Hill Farm.

I object to development at Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill Farm (A25)

I object to the lack of provision for alternatives to car use. The local bus service is reduced every year as is the Park and Ride service. These are only really useful to people who have no time constraints. Cycling would be a dangerous option as our village lanes would be more overcrowded and they are unsafe now for individual cyclists.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9160  Respondent: 8907393 / Helen Cannon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18432</th>
<th>Respondent: 8909761 / Diana Grover</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11208</th>
<th>Respondent: 8910145 / Mr G.W. &amp; Mrs A.C. Spratt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11729</th>
<th>Respondent: 8910145 / Mr G.W. &amp; Mrs A.C. Spratt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPP16/9435  Respondent: 8910817 / Anne Elkington  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the local plan as it will endanger the many cyclists that enjoy the country lanes. with the increase in traffic this will lead to an increase in accidents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16109  Respondent: 8911617 / Charles Hope  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The avowed intention of the Plan is to provide additional employment; yet this is proposed to the West of the town - and the extra housing in West (and East) Horsley is to the East of the town. This will cause extra strain on an already congested (overloaded) road system in the town. In any case, the South East of the Country does not need further expansion if any quality of life is to be maintained.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2682  Respondent: 8913985 / Lynda Newland  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in pollution that will be generated by the increased traffic on our already overcrowded roads. The A3 and M25 cannot cope with the traffic now so how will they cope with extra traffic from development in Wisley, Send Marsh and Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15969  Respondent: 8914465 / John & Elizabeth Maycock  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have already stated that the proposed density of new housing in the parishes of West and East Horsley will greatly increase the problems of the present road network, much of which consists of narrow country lanes, and of public
transport. There is little or no excess parking at East Horsley station now. The trains are full at peak times and the bus service is fairly rudimentary. Add to this the proposal for the former Wisley Airfield and there is a prospect of near gridlock on the roads and insupportable conditions at the amenities and services in the two villages. There is nothing in the Local Plan which proposes any positive development to meet increases in population - only pious wishes. The concept of developers being expected to propose and secure "travel plans" for each development and contribute to transport arrangements can only be ineffective and weak. A proper development strategy would put forward positive plans to meet such an enormous population increase.

I object to the Local Plan in its present form for lack of clear transport proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12081  Respondent: 8914945 / Nichola Armstrong  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy 13 because it is not realistic. It expects everyone to walk, cycle, glide down a river or use public transport. GBC will not be able to support this Policy because they do not control Public Transport. Private operators do and they have control of the timetables and fares. If the buses, trains or boats are not economically viable or not subsidised by SCC the operators will stop them. Not all public transport even goes where you need to go. How will we get to work and will residents be able to afford public transport. People can’t afford fares now, let alone in the future. This is a weak and unrealistic policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1428  Respondent: 8917665 / Frances Porter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the idea of a large scale settlement within Wisley/Ockham. Ockham is only a small village with narrow winding country lanes totally unsuitable for an extra 5,000 cars!

I object to the local plan as the transport issues will be huge. People will not be able to cycle to the stations there are no cycle paths and no room on the narrow country lands for them. The A3/M25 junction is already gridlocked every morning, it cannot take any more cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9521  Respondent: 8918657 / Tim Handley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Policy i3: Sustainable transport for developers versus finite and inadequate local Infrastructure

I OBJECT TO Policy i3 and the Local Plan’s woefully inadequate provision for transport and infrastructure arrangements to support its housing and development plans. The policy fails to provide any concrete obligation on developers to address weaknesses in transport – and there are practical reasons why this will not be possible in East and West Horsley and the surrounding villages (including Ockham / Wisley).

Road widths will not accommodate increased bus use through the villages and I see no acceptable solution to the need to provide access from the newly developed houses to employment which will, inevitably, be based outside of the village communities. Busses and lorries are frequently forced into the middle of the roads to manoeuvre around bends or avoid tree branches, exacerbating congestion. Pavements are narrow and there is no scope to widen thoroughfares to accommodate the inevitable increase in traffic. Local rail station car parks are already full and rail services are woefully overcrowded, particularly heading to / from London where many of the employment opportunities lie. Road-widths combined with the size of many modern cars and commercial vehicles make commuting by bicycle totally unsafe and there is no room for the provision of cycle lanes. New residents will have few options but to commute to work by car, leading to an unacceptable level of traffic on the roads through Ockham and the Horsleys. The draft Plan fails to recognise that the majority of the infrastructure in East and West Horsley is finite, is not capable of expansion and has no capacity to absorb a large increase in population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Infrastructure/sustainability

- Huge increase in traffic
- Village roads incapable of sustaining higher traffic levels
- Extremely limited public transport see local time table for buses and trains
- Reliance on cars not sustainable
- Lack of station parking
- Lack of visitors/tourists parking
- Under capacity of sewers and treatment works
- Broadband update required at present
- Flooding already a problem in places

Other

- Air quality already poor at rush hour
- Tourism will be lost as green belt is lost

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
totally unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, in particular for the volume of HGV’s now using them. It is inevitable that the proposed developments in East Horsley itself and nearby, particularly in West Horsley and the proposals for Wisley Airfield site, will put further strain on the existing infrastructure. There are no proposals at all to cater for this.

I therefore OBJECT to the proposals for infrastructure in that they do not meet the stated objective of providing infrastructure to support the proposed developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11989  Respondent: 8921377 / Paul Maycox  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13018  Respondent: 8921569 / Steven Cliff  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan states in paragraph 4.6.27 that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The congestion that will be caused by the significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will not be sufficiently mitigated by travel plans. Residential areas will suffer greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5791  Respondent: 8924577 / Charles Lee  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

TRAFFIC AND PARKING

Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected.

Local Road Network:

In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well

Pollution:

The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Transport:

Misery for commuters, nowhere to park and full trains at commuting times.
I support provision of off-street parking for residential developments. This ought also to be an objective for the established areas of older small houses that have no on-site parking of their own. However, for non-residential developments located in and around the town centre this is not appropriate - it negates the whole objective of location to allow use of sustainable transport by employees and clients.

I strongly object to any development being built that does not have existing sustainable transport. Blackwell Farm, Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Garlicks Arch do not have such facilities. The former Wisley Airfield is absolutely isolated and can only be accessed by car. Even if a bus service is provided, few will carry shopping, etc., by bus. Walking to Ripley or East Horsley is unrealistic as there are no footpaths or lighting. Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill are in the same situation. New developments should take place alongside existing sustainable transport facilities. The Merrow Golf Club, proposed for housing, is adjacent to a Park and Ride, that is an example of sustainable transport.

I object to the new local plan as follows

1. I object to the increase in the volume of traffic that so many new homes will generate.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3541  Respondent: 8927233 / Clare Maguire   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object because the train services at peak times will be overwhelmed. As it is, one just about gets a seat at Horsley. By the time the train gets to Effingham and Cobham it is standing room only.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3545  Respondent: 8927233 / Clare Maguire   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12. I object because of the compound effect of development on so many adjoining villages. What I have seen does not properly accommodate this. Bottlenecks will be created. look at the situation when the utilities dig up Ockham Rd North or Ockham Rd South. The detour when the bridge was out of action was along roads that were unsuitable. Plus locals used roads like The Drift causing misery to local people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11714  Respondent: 8928033 / P. Richardson   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3) Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11940  **Respondent:** 8928289 / Trevor Skerritt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

- **I OBJECT** to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4460  **Respondent:** 8930209 / Ray Corstin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. **POLICY I3**

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16989  **Respondent:** 8931649 / Ray Briggs  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

The numbers of houses planned for Guildford as a whole will lead to considerable congestion in the borough which will adversely affect the the commercial life of this borough and surrounding areas. The concentration of developments close to the junction of the A3 and A31 (Blackwell Farm in particular but also developments on the Hospital, Science Park and Cathedral sites, and to a lesser extent all other developments west of the town centre)will have a major detrimental impact on the flow of traffic on the A3 and A31. This junction is already a congestion hotspot and even another carriageway from Stoke to the University roundabout will not cope with the increase in traffic which can be anticipated. The mention of mitigating interventions implies changes to local communities to try to alleviate this problem as it develops but these solutions are not described so it is impossible to judge if they will be adequate and what the impacts
will be. It seems likely that the whole of the west of Guildford will be blighted by this. Other developments threaten to do the same to the rest of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15512  
Respondent: 8932097 / Robert Charlwood  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Guildford for almost 30 years, I have seen it grow and grow without any apparent thought for what the infrastructure can reasonably sustain.

From my observations; The main roads, especially the A3, cannot cope in the rush hours, and nearly all the proposed developments will adversely affect the A3.

Therefore, in my opinion, It would be totally irresponsible to propose major developments, some in the Green Belt, at Gosden Hill (2000 homes), Blackwell Farm (1800 homes), Wisley (2000), Normandy (1000 homes), Send (400 homes) and Guildford (3000 homes), before the A3 is able to cope with the existing situation.

I suggest that there should be a complete freeze on all major housing developments until the above is rectified, i.e. a tunnel is built for the A3 through Guildford.

I would also point out that there is considerable housing construction taking place, infilling, replacing old properties with several units, which seems to be ignored in the housing need number.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18538  
Respondent: 8933185 / Peter See  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Page 113, Policy I3: Sustainable Transport for New Developments

provide secure: provide adequate, secure

provide a Travel Plans: Provide a Travel Plan

Objection - Delete 'where there is a clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage the Local Road Network.’ Insert ‘Adequate parking off-street must be provided to help safety, traffic flow and amenity. Driveways will be provided for houses as they are convenient and secure for parking’ Take in Paragraph 4.2.8 on Pages 8-9 of this letter or similar wording.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: pslp171/822  Respondent: 8933537 / Annie Ladd  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/3236  Respondent: 8934561 / Chris Jubb  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Guildford appears to have very limited influence on the road network since the A3 which has a profound influence on traffic circulation is in the hands the Highways Agency who work to their own timetable, funding cycles and priorities. The Sustainable Movement Corridor seems to be based on wishful thinking. It appears a worthy attempt to modernise and ramp up the use of more environmentally friendly transport, but given the constricted amount of space available it will inevitably restrict traffic volumes and add to congestion instead of easing it. Modal shift will not occur if journey times are longer; bus passengers and cyclists will only use it if it is convenient and journey times are short and reliably consistent. Traffic congestion is expected to increase during the plan period which is an extraordinary thing to plan for.

The Borough is in a difficult place, both literally and metaphorically. Limited space and resources to expand to meet its housing and business expectations and to develop the infrastructure to support this expansion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14428  Respondent: 8934945 / David Grimmond  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The transport evidence is very weak and major transport issues are unresolved e.g. another river crossing in the town, a central bus depot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Of particular concern with the latest plan is the proposal for a new 4-way junction at Burnt Common. This area already suffers considerably when there is any accident or congestion nearby on the P.3 or M25. The provision of additional access will simply add to the problem of vehicles attempting to avoid that congestion by emptying on to local roads. Only a few weeks ago a lorry caused significant damage to the railway bridge over Ockham Road North, ignoring the warning height limit signs.

It is clear from comments made by Surrey County Council, the Highways Authority and Thames Water, amongst others, that they also have significant concerns that the infrastructure will not cope as it currently stands and that the proposed Local Plan does not include any or sufficient provision for the likely increase in road traffic, drainage needs and school places. These issues should be addressed properly so as to provide a proper and agreed framework within which any development should take place, not left to be dealt with on a piecemeal basis as we go along.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Whilst we support the principle of sustainable transport, it has been ineffectively introduced in Guildford. The council seems to believe that a white line can be painted on the side of the road and it can be designated “a cycle path”. Cars
frequently park over these paths, making them extremely dangerous for the cyclist. There is no enforcement, so these paths fall into disuse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17058  
**Respondent:** 8944257 / Bruce Tindale  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

15. **I object** that housing being proposed on the Green Belt will increase traffic bringing increased danger and pollution and slower journey times on our already overcrowded village roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17218  
**Respondent:** 8944929 / A Jefferies  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I object** to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air quality in many parts of the borough is in excess of the EU permitted levels. Additional traffic with exacerbate this situation impacting the health of all current and future residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17225  
**Respondent:** 8944929 / A Jefferies  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I object** to the fact that the plan implies modal shift to cycling and walking which in the rural areas is completely unrealistic due to lack of proper cycle lanes on local roads (and the space to provide them). This plan disenfranchises the elderly, the young, the unwell and the disabled.

**I object** to the fact that the plan implies modal shift to cycling and walking which in the rural areas is completely unrealistic due to lack of proper pedestrian footpaths on local roads and the requisite street lighting to ensure the safety of users. Much of the borough is RURAL IN NATURE and residents specifically do not want to live in well-lit areas more akin to urban living.

---

Section page number  
Page 134 of 484  
Document page number  
1689
I object to the impact of excessive development on the already congested Strategic Road Network particularly on the A3 and M25.

I object to the fact that there is no tolerance planned at all for accidents, roadworks etc on the SRN which already impact local roads often resulting in gridlock. I cannot imagine that funding is available post-Brexit as the economy looks weaker whilst the country repositions itself.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2739  Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

28. I object to the wording of policy ID3 para 11 which makes no sense at all. What do you mean by “the provision of additional public off-street parking in Guildford town centre will be supported when it facilitates the interception of trips that would otherwise derive through the Guildford gyratory”.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1517  Respondent: 8946721 / Fiona Middleton  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4. The impact of the the increase in traffic has been totally underestimated. Most families have at least one, and in this area due to the cost of living most people have 2 adults working per household and hence many have 2 cars. On the already congested roads the new 14000 new houses would bring at least that many additional cars and probably more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9386  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments

I OBJECT to this policy as currently worded. The wording ("we will expect") is too weak.
Whilst I support the idea that transport within the borough should be more sustainable, you can't expect people to cycle when the roads are so dangerous (and likely to become more so with the increased traffic generated by the proposed developments) or to use public transport when it is so sparse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/16174</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to this policy as currently worded. The wording (“we will expect”) is too weak.

Whilst I support the idea that transport within the borough should be more sustainable, you can’t expect people to cycle when the roads are so dangerous (and likely to become more so with the increased traffic generated by the proposed developments) or to use public transport when it is so sparse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp171/2528</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy ID3: Sustainable transport for new developments

I OBJECT to the changes. Item 4.6.20 makes a statement that is clearly at odds with the choice of sites which will generate a major increase in private motor vehicle journeys.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/8051</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8954529 / Maggi Moss</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allowing development of the Green Belt to fund transport schemes will simply generate more traffic from more homes and add to congestion which is already a major problem for the town.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I believe the transport requirements have not been thought through as it is my understanding that even if all the proposed highway improvements in the plan were built congestion would not improve and we would have a lot more people stuck in traffic with nowhere to go.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to this policy.

• The practicalities of sustainable transport have not been properly considered, it is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable. Not everyone can cycle all the time.

• Large developments outside the town centre cannot maximise sustainable travel. The further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

• Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle – and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?

• The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a hoppa bus can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am concerned about both of the above given the proposed increase in traffic that the excessive additional housebuilding would create,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/1040  Respondent: 8997345 / Eileen (Lee) Cartwright  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Traffic implications for the Tyting area

The lanes of the Surrey Hills are only suited to carrying a low level of traffic, often being narrow single track roads, as is the case for Halfpenny Lane and White Lane/Guildford Lane in the Tyting area.

The combination of the scale of growth proposed in this 2017 plan and a reduction of capacity in the town centre (as indicated by the plans for the Sustainable Movement Corridor and the Town Centre Regeneration Strategy) threatens to lead to much more peak hour traffic on minor roads around the town as drivers find alternatives routes.

This potential impact on the lanes should be avoided and the character of the lanes protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15972  Respondent: 9007457 / Belinda Baker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The roads are grid locked already and the here is no infrastructure in place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9952  Respondent: 9039745 / Nicholas Palmer  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Living in Compton I am very concerned at the impact it will have on not just our already heavily over used road which already suffers from very high pollution.
It seems we would be sucked into the urban sprawl of Guildford losing our rural positioning as a small village. I believe it has been suggested the proposal for 2600 new homes at Dunsfold and associated services would not increase traffic volumes through Compton. I think there is some very naïve thinking on that issue. The road structure as it seems does not work at this time; higher volumes will bring massive gridlock. I know people are reluctant to come to Guildford simply because of traffic problems; more will not help the businesses of Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

POLICY I3 Sustainable transport for new developments

OBJECT I support the concept of sustainable transport but object on the grounds that the practicalities have not been properly considered,

- It is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable.

Not everyone can cycle all the time.

How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process - the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle - and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?

The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a “hoppa bus” can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.

While I welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations (subject to negotiation with Network Rail) there could unintended consequences.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Item 4.6.20 makes a statement that is clearly at odds with the choice of sites which will generate a major increase in private motor vehicle journeys.

**Appendix C Infrastructure Schedule**

The earliest dates for the railway stations at Park Barn and Merrow are not expected before 2024 (six years later than first anticipated).

Two road safety schemes for the A3 have been abandoned.

SCC appear to have washed their hands of involvement in the delivery of a number of highway developments on the local road network (which is their responsibility), (E.g. those in LRN7).

LRN7 (For Wisley Airfield) is an example of inadequate infrastructure requirements to address the problems that would be created by a strategic site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3056  **Respondent:** 9068161 / B Crosta  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am writing to oppose the proposal to remove the Green Belt protection from some of the villages in the Guildford area. As a resident of Chilworth for the past 15 years I feel very strongly about the traffic situation in and around Chilworth, Shalford and the traffic that approaches from the Peasmarsh direction.

If future development is granted in these villages roads will become even more unbearable than they currently are at peak times and in the case of the Shalford to Guildford road at any time of the day. It is absolutely absurd that it regularly takes 45 minutes to do a 5 minute journey. Safety of school children in Chilworth is already compromised with cars parked all along the road at pick up and drop off, more houses will mean more children and more cars and the higher risk of an accident to happen.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/18566  **Respondent:** 9079393 / Wisley Property Investments Ltd.  **Agent:** Savills (Charles Collins)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments

Support (Sound)
WPI supports the draft policy. As outlined, transport technical evidence in support of the Wisley new settlement is included at Appendix 3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 160715_Local_Plan_Reps_July_2016_and_Appendices.pdf (11.0 MB)

---

Comment ID: pslp171/2761  Respondent: 9079393 / Wisley Property Investments Ltd.  Agent: Savills (Jim Beavan)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/ Section / page / para</th>
<th>Original Changes requested (July 2016 Representation)</th>
<th>Understanding of changes shown in the Focused Amendments (June 2017)</th>
<th>WPI Comments (Updated Representation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy I3: Sustainable Transport for New Developments Page 113</td>
<td>WPI supports the draft policy.</td>
<td>(Pages 128 to 130). The title of the policy is now “ID3.” There have been changes to the policy wording which now appears more robust. For example, “new development will be required to, in so far as its site’s size, characteristics and location allow, to maximise…” This has replaced the text “we will expect new development to…” New paragraphs have been added on the sustainable movement corridor (3), parking (4) and the Guildford parking strategy (5). In addition, new reference is made to provision of car club (6). Clarification has been provided on the need for new development to provide or fund access and transport infrastructure (7).</td>
<td>Changes noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9173  Respondent: 9094497 / Janet Stiles  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

---
I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Transport

Traffic generated from the proposed housing would be considerable if you consider most households have 2 cars or more, plus cycles. Bus services are limited and only operate 2-3 times/day Monday to Friday. Horsley station has limited parking and at times is full on a weekday. An increase in village population will increase pressure on the station parking and traffic movement to and from the station. The access to the A3 in Ockham is already dangerous at peak times, with traffic joining the A3 from both Ripley and the Horsleys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the increase in traffic, (at least 25,000 vehicles,) that the Proposed Plan will incur. Gridlock will prevail in many locations, e.g. A3/Wisley interchange, the A3/M25, and also the A246/Ockham Road South, not to mention the A3...
around Guildford itself. Our local roads in the Horsleys, and Ockham are narrow, winding lanes and will become very
dangerous with greatly increased traffic, putting the many cyclists at risk. There are already unavoidable “pinch points”,
such as in Ockham Road South, where vehicles find it difficult to pass a bus, lorry or even large van.

I object to the air quality in the area being further polluted by the increased traffic

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13160</th>
<th>Respondent: 9243073 / John Hartley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large greenbelt schemes should be avoided. There is not the infrastructure to cope. The “war on the motorist” means
there has been no substantial road building for the last twenty years. Ripley High Street is blocked at rush hour now, so it
cannot cope with additional traffic from Garlick’s Arch or Wisley airfield/Three Meadows.

We need new dual carriageways. A Southern bypass for Guildford (A31 to A25). The Hindhead tunnel shows how this
could be done. Plus the Woking Eastern Approach Road (WEAR) needs to be resurrected.

Promoting walking/cycling is good, but remember, we have an ageing population who will need to drive & park. You
need to increase short stay parking near shops/doctor’s surgeries & more disabled parking

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4484</th>
<th>Respondent: 9298465 / Peter Grover</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **POLICY I3**

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental
impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the
north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution,
which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14965</th>
<th>Respondent: 9327009 / sp2 Consulting Limited (Stephen Parker)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I OBJECT. I support the concept of sustainable transport but object on the grounds that the practicalities have not been properly considered, including:

- It is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable.
- Not everyone can cycle all the time.
- How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process - the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.
- Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle – and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?
- The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a “hoppa bus” can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.
- While I welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations (subject to negotiation with Network Rail) there could unintended consequences.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10659  **Respondent:** 9335041 / David Reeve  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3: Sustainable Transport for New Developments

Like the policies above this policy has initial appeal that does not bear detailed examination; it reads very much as though it has been copied from a manual of some sort.

As commented at the start of this response letter, there is little point in “expecting” various deliverables from new developments; this Policy has to “require” them or they simply won’t be delivered. This policy needs to be redrafted.

I also see that paragraph 4.6.22 still contains the statement from the previous draft that “For the average person cycling has the potential to substitute for short car trips, particularly under five kilometres, and walking for trips under one kilometre”. While it’s correct that the potential exists, the chance of it happening (without a massive campaign, coupled with a major increase in fuel prices) is very small. Just as an exercise, it would be very interesting to carry out a survey of Council staff to find out how far from work they live, and how many ever cycle to work. Of those that do, a supplementary question should be on how many days in the year they do so. One only has to drive in Guildford in the rush hour to know that it’s a small proportion of the total.

To be fair, making changes to established travel habits will be difficult, and the planning system is just one part of the overall whole. But nevertheless, bearing in mind the requirements of NPPF paragraph[.]

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
**OBJECT (on 3 distinct grounds)**

1. Paragraph 11 is understandable – but it needs to be amplified by further conditions. At present it effectively states that the Planners would have no option but to support an application for off-street parking that reduced traffic through the gyratory … even if the design was the most hideous concept that had ever been created. I’m sure that is not the intention, but this wording is a serious hostage to fortune.

2. The drafting of this Policy is inadequate: a) I have no idea what the practical meaning of paragraph 6 of this Policy means. Will it be a planning condition? Will the Council pay for it? At present it really doesn’t say anything. b) I also fail to understand what paragraph 7 of the Policy really means. If it is not readily understandable, it fails the test of NPPF paragraph 154.

3. In the interests of making best use of land, all new parking in the town should be required to be multi-storey, and should preferably include at least some floors below ground level.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSSLPP16/5879  **Respondent:** 9412065 / Stephen Bray  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I3 - Sustainable transport for new developments:

I support this policy, but see little evidence of its application in the case of West Horsley. I believe it to be fundamental and crucial, particularly in a semi-rural setting such as West Horsley, that there is infrastructural provision made for walking and cycling, which is very much the national drive towards a healthier and safer lifestyle in this the 21st century.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSSLPP16/6365  **Respondent:** 9607905 / Anne Pascoe  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Enterprise M3 welcomes the strong emphasis throughout the plan on the benefits of investment in sustainable transport and the recognition that such investment can contribute significantly to economic growth. We are therefore supportive of Policy I3 related to sustainable transport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

11. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I have read some of the documents on your website and it appears to me that some of the articles are written assuming that the decision has been made to house many more people than can be sustained in the area.

It is surely self-evident that traffic in the area cannot be increased without significant degradation of the living standards of the current population.

Two examples will clearly demonstrate this. The first is the commuter trains that head to London every morning and return every evening. Your staff, since they are based in Guildford, will not have experienced the overcrowding that is apparent every day of the week. Delays are frequent and the trains inadequate - among other things they do not have air-conditioning.

No doubt your response will be that the platforms are being extended and will be able to accommodate more passengers. My view is that, with the extended platforms, the current commuter traffic can be accommodated; not increased traffic resulting from all the additional houses that are planned.

Secondly, it appears from your plans that road traffic will be alleviated by the realignment of roads around the A3 / M25 junction. This is a complete fallacy. I travel on the road from Horsley to Cobham every weekday morning and find that 90% of the time the M25 heading clockwise is backed up and unable to move around 7:30 in the morning. What hope is there to improve this situation if the A3 / M25 junction is improved. This will do nothing to improve the traffic flow on the M25 which is already a dangerously crowded road at rush hour.

There are many other objections that I have and I feel that the views of the majority of current residents are being rode roughshod over by studies that purport to claim that the expansion of housing in the area will be achieved with minimal disruption.

I therefore submit my objection to these schemes in the strongest terms to ensure that the countryside is preserved and we do not all end up in continuous traffic jams and dangerously overcrowded trains.

I look forward to hearing that these plans are stopped in the near future and also look forward to your reply to confirm that you are of a similar view.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  💻 IMG_20141005_0001.pdf (1.4 MB)
3) The potential increase in cyclists' deaths on the roads around Horsley and the Wisley airfield. The road from Cobham to East Horsley is already heavily trafficked by cyclists. Heavy lorries during construction and subsequently traffic from the owners of the new houses will significantly increase the risk of deaths.

4) The train service from Horsley and Effingham Junction is already overloaded at rush hour. The additional house will make commuting by train to London impossible; if not for Horsley and Effingham Junction users then further up the line to London.

5) It is interesting to note that the golf course in The Drift was planning to re-landscape the course. There were objections from the council complaining that heavy lorries would be dangerous around the narrow roads around East and West Horsley.

6) The narrow roads in the area cannot accommodate such heavy additional traffic.

I request that you reconsider such a plan immediately to prevent the congestion (and potential deaths) that will come from such ill-thoughtout ideas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3566  Respondent: 10562049 / Ian Cameron  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Transport

Your Transport 2016 report states “Existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and would worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life, particularly in:... Send, particularly Potters Lane, ...”. Therefore, I object because all the proposed developments in Send (A42, A43, A44, and particularly A43a) with have a significant negative effect on the transport infrastructure, which your consultants say is already inadequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3567  Respondent: 10562049 / Ian Cameron  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Sustainability

I object to all the proposed housing developments in Send (A42, A43, A44) because they will all promote the opposite of “encouraging sustainable forms of transport”, “conserving landscape character”, and “providing housing to meet local needs”, and most of the other Sustainability criteria. I object because, obviously as a resident ,I can see for myself that local amenities at present are either inadequate or under strain, and therefore will not meet the required Sustainability criteria with the influx of another thousand or so people. The Sustainability report 2016 seems just to pay vague lip-service to GBC plans, rather than being properly fact-based, truthful, and pragmatic on these matters.
Comment ID: PSLPP16/9175  Respondent: 10616321 / Petrina Jeffereson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4416  Respondent: 10616769 / Royal Mail  Agent: Royal Mail (Cushman & Wakefield) (Helen Harris)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Transport Considerations

Royal Mail are fully supportive of the Council’s commitment to working to facilitate major, long-term improvements to the A3 trunk road and M25 motorway in order to improve capacity and safety as indicated in Policy I2 (Supporting the Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”).

It is requested that Royal Mail be kept informed of proposals for highways improvements in sufficient time in advance to enable for alternative transport arrangements to be put into effect/ effective re-routing strategies to be implemented to facilitate operations scheduling.

Conclusion

Royal Mail would welcome further engagement with Guildford Borough Council particularly where proposals would impact on the usage of the highway and allocations / sites next to or adjacent to the Delivery Offices coming forward for redevelopment.

I trust that these representations are acceptable and would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt and keep me informed of future stages of the adoption of the Guildford Borough Council Local Plan and other planning policy documents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/573  Respondent: 10617601 / G Rabin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There are problems on A3/M25 most days as these roads are at capacity NOW. Everything comes to a standstill. On these days, more vehicles come through the village, trying to find alternative routes which causes long lines of traffic. Access on to the A3 at Burnt Common will not ease the congestion if there are so many more vehicles using the local roads.

Air pollution from thousands of extra cars affecting children, the elderly and even the RHS at Wisley.

Pedestrian and cyclist will be less safe on more crowded local roads.

I am not convinced we need all these new homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9104  Respondent: 10619137 / J. M. Holgate  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

More houses will mean more cars - some households will have more than one. The main route through East Horsley is a fairly narrow B-road, which is increasingly used by unsuitably large vehicles, which use it as a short cut from the M25/ A3 to the A246. A car meeting one of these is forced onto the pavement, which is illegal & a hazard for pedestrians. This road cannot be widened because there are houses on either side. WE NEED TO REDUCE THE TRAFFIC, NOT INCREASE IT. The Thatchers site, which is next to a busy petrol station, will have access onto the A246 on an S-bend, where there is already a junction with Ockham Road South. This will surely become an accident black spot.

I appreciate that there may be a need for some new houses in the area, but nothing like the number proposed, which would completely change the character of the Horsleys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12675  Respondent: 10619169 / Wendy Critchlow  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The proposed developments west of Guildford, in particular A29 and A46, when considered in conjunction with the Aldershot Urban Extension planned by the adjacent county, are unsound in terms of sustainable transport infrastructure.

The proposed road upgrades under Policy I3 as described in Appendix C of the Local Plan will not mitigate the road usage forecast in SCC’s OGSTAR Scenario 7. Neither will the proposed new railway station or cycle route.

A possible solution might be a Bus Rapid Transit network using the disused railway alignment through Ash as part of its alignment. The transit of the green belt between the Ash/Tongham and Guildford urban areas would generate environmental impact issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

We have a neighbourhood plan in Burpham that protects the open spaces in the locality but was unable to prevent a sustainable movement corridor being suggested which I feel is unsound. There is no room on the roads to carry the proposed cycle, traffic and pedestrians particularly at the roundabouts

1. Woodruff Ave – George Abbott School
2. Kingspost Parade – Retail shops
3. Sainsbury’s

Add into this mix a proposed development of 2000 homes at Gosden Hill.

No evidence of the additional pollution of this slow extra traffic to cyclists and locals on foot.

I also wish to support the Guildford Residents Association points and oppose the intended increase to the size of Guildford by a quarter; mostly north of the town, in this draft plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I wish to strongly object to the above Plan.

Reasons:

1. Infrastructure:

Both Glaziers Lane and Westwood Lane, which on the Plan are either side of the proposed project, are narrow country lanes. Westwood Lane has a narrow one way system under the railway bridge and on Glaziers Lane the bridge has a bend and blind spot. Neither road has foot paths its entire length, not without crossing from side to side, and on Glaziers Lane one has to cross on a bend. The A323 is extremely busy, especially at peak times. The turning into Glaziers Lane from A323 is extremely tight and I have witnessed accidents there. The thought of another 2,000 car owners plus the extra traffic a school would bring does not bear thinking about.

I strongly request an Inspector views these roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4 knots, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been sufficiently worked out.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. Proposed developments on Sites A42, A43, A43A, A44.

I wish to object to the proposed developments on these sites. The combination of these new housing proposals gives rise to population increase of over 25%. This is a clear overdevelopment of the three settlements. The lack of infrastructure has already been noted. In particular, the A247, the main artery through Send is extremely congested. Send is a classic linear village and most of the house along the A247 were constructed before the car era and lack off-road parking facilities and inconsequence many cars are permanently parked on road. This is a source of traffic congestion with long tailbacks in the morning and evening rush hours and delays at other times when large vehicles traverse the village. The situation will be exacerbated later this year when the new St Bede’s school opens (Planning application 16/P/00033 Approved GBC 31st March 2016) as access to both infants and junior school will now be from the A247 effected doubling the number of pupils arriving in that way. While the planning application included a School Green Travel Plan to minimise car journeys to the school the mitigation measures of increased cycling and walking are difficult to implement as footpaths and cycle paths are inadequate. Public transport is not an option as no buses pass the school. Inevitably increased car use will result giving more congestion with increased risks to children.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the

borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
8. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure

The Plan would cause an inevitable increase in Road Traffic Accidents involving both cars and cyclists and thus the number of deaths due to R.T.As.

The congestion affecting Ripley High Street, particularly at the junction of Newark Road, will worsen and local businesses will be deleteriously affected, as will the already poor road surfaces.

Parking in Ripley is already ridiculously hard and such a gargantuan increase in the number of cars will make it impossible.

10. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure

The Plan would cause an inevitable increase in Road Traffic Accidents involving both cars and cyclists and thus the number of deaths due to R.T.As.

The congestion affecting Ripley High Street, particularly at the junction of Newark Road, will worsen and local businesses will be deleteriously affected, as will the already poor road surfaces.

Parking in Ripley is already ridiculously hard and such a gargantuan increase in the number of cars will make it impossible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I would like my comments below to be seen by the Inspector and are taken into consideration since I have been resident of Ripley & Send since 1977 and I have seen the area worsening due to increasing traffic within the poor infrastructure in Riple and Send areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7811  Respondent: 10721537 / Stephen Niblett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are to be built within the Green Belt land running along the A3. This will destroy the open enjoyment of the borough and produce even more accidents (currently at least one a week) on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already running at 200% capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7813  Respondent: 10721537 / Stephen Niblett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the large proposed development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land (which now that we are exiting the European common market, will be needed for farmers to grow crop. The traffic generated from these houses will increase massively congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads like Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17915  Respondent: 10722049 / Richard Smith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the poor air quality that the proposed developments will give rise to (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through any
road improvements. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and may result in increased early deaths.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11721  Respondent: 10723553 / Judith Pound  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13). The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6974  Respondent: 10724769 / P. Broughton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the large proposed development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send, Send Marsh and Ripley.

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4142  Respondent: 10727201 / Graham Rutherford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan for the following reasons;

We live in Burpham. The proposed developments at Gosden Hill and Wisley will obviously increase the volume of traffic in the area. We live in Orchard Road which exits onto the old London Road near the BP garage. At busy times it is already difficult to leave our road because of the volume of tightly packed traffic in what is effectively the slip road off
the southbound A3 not only for traffic coming into Guildford itself but also going through Jacobs Well to access, inter
alia, the southern side of Woking.

It may be expected that one day there will be a tunnel bypass under Guildford and the northern entrance is likely to be on
Martin Grant land.

Therefore the suggested development on Gosden Hill should be halved in the number of homes.

Guildford desperately needs new homes for the benefit of the current workers and population, our children and
grandchildren but much more thought needs to be given to seriously expanding the current infrastructure of roads, water
supply, sewage and utilities. Upfront integrated thinking is needed and funding made available.

We should not argue about the forecast needs of homes. The problem is to get started and see how the needs develop
especially since the Brexit decision may reduce demand long term.

Another urgent need is to expand the south bound exit from Guildford onto the A3. At busy times this is log jammed
because three lanes are squeezed into two.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10690  Respondent: 10727489 / Gaynor Eke  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

• I OBJECT to the impact on the infrastructure around the villages. The roads around Send and Ripley are already
congested and cannot cope with the current needs. The Local Plan does not incorporate a detailed transport
infrastructure strategy that would demonstrate how the road network would support the additional pressure on
the roads and other amenities if the proposed development went ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6084  Respondent: 10734241 / A. Cude  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

We are writing to express our grave concerns regarding the proposed housing & road development in the Send / Burnt
Common / Send Marsh area

There are several reasons for our concern which we will explain here.

However, the worst impact in our opinion will be to traffic. The traffic through Send is already chaotic in the mornings &
evenings. Caused by the volume of cars heading to and from Burnt Common Roundabout, heading for London M25 (via
Ripley village), Guildford, both via the A3 and to/from Woking. Sometimes the traffic queue from Burnt Common
roundabout tails back into the middle of the village, even beyond the Send Marsh Road junction. This is compounded by
thoughtless parents parking willy-nilly all around the infant school dropping off or collecting their kids. Send surgery carpark (for surgery patients) is also nearly always full of ‘school run’ vehicles, meaning patients have nowhere to park. This will get ten-fold worse when St Bedes School also moves to the same site. Tannery lane crossroads is chaotic and dangerous at the best of times - this too will get much worse along with the Send Marsh Road cut through used by many drivers to avoid the Burnt Common roundabout - both already being accident black spots.

Added to this we have the Send Hill and Potters Lane problem. This route is already used heavily as a cut through from the northbound A3. It is very narrow around the cemetery and almost impossible to pass at times due to bad parking etc. Also the worrying prospect of traveler sites (and face the facts, we all know what that means) in one of the nicest and most peaceful place in the village. Many people have paid a fortune to be laid to rest in the cemetery. Who will guarantee that it will be kept clean, tidy, quiet and respectable especially when a funeral is taking place?

We notice a new slip road is proposed just south of the A3 at Tithebarns Lane junction, to join the A3 northbound so as to not necessitate passing through Ripley. This will not work! It will simply create peak time traffic jams in Clandon Road back to Burnt Common roundabout and into Send Barns Lane due to the volume of vehicles trying (unable) to join the traffic jam on the already snarled up A3 heading northwards. Note: The existing peak time northbound traffic on the A3, already tails back southwards from the M25 entry slip, back past the northbound Ripley entry slip road and sometime almost back to the Burpham junction. Peak time traffic joining the A3 northbound at the new proposed slip road will simply be trying to join a traffic jam.

If ever there’s a major incident on the A3 or the M25, this entire area just becomes one gigantic car park which will only ever get worse if huge extra volumes of traffic are encouraged.

Whoever has studied this, clearly has never had to use (& has no knowledge of) the roads around this entire area at peak times.

Also please bear-in-mind there are hundreds of very elderly people in the Send area who need to negotiate these roads on foot, and also who have no access to PC’s & emails etc to express their worries and heartbreak at these proposals. Our once beautiful village & surrounding area being swallowed up and ruined as London continues to spew outside of the M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4175</th>
<th>Respondent: 10742945 / Trevor Brider</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The public transport in West Horsley would be incapable of taking more capacity. As the few roads through the village are two way and at points merge into one it would not be practical for more traffic e.g. buses and more school transport to flow freely at school times in particular.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13093</th>
<th>Respondent: 10756033 / John Herbert</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object that housing on the Green Belt will increase traffic bringing increased danger and pollution and slower journey times to our existing overcrowded roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6941</th>
<th>Respondent: 10756449 / Richard and Valerie Overton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5001</th>
<th>Respondent: 10758593 / Richard &amp; Delia Baker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12236  Respondent: 10765249 / Andy & Sonja Freebody  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11757  Respondent: 10768417 / James Ward  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6). Increase in Traffic.

The inevitable increase in traffic as a result of more housing in this area will create more pollution in the form of exhaust gases and noise which will have an unhealthy affect on residents.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that that Plan is amended accordingly,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12600  Respondent: 10769121 / Ali Elson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4046  Respondent: 10771521 / J Weller  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Further to reading the new local plan. I wish to express my objections to large parts of it especially the area of Send village which is where I grew up. This is point A40-A44 inclusive on the online plan. I would like to say that this is a rural village and should stay as one and the number of new homes being built within the village and that of Ripley reduced greatly. He traffic will be terrible and I object to the green belt being built upon. We should be preserving these green villages and should look to a lesser amount of homes or an alternative. Also I object to the amount of extra pollution from the amount of cars in the village will produce and also that from the proposed industrial sites. I object to the sheer scale of proposals and would like the green village to remain a green village!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  GBC Local Plan - SPC Takeaway for Residents 14 June 2016.pdf (1.7 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13  Respondent: 10772865 / Peter Chandler  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Further points to note are the infrastructure is simply not in place to accommodate such development, indeed the railway bridge on Westwood lane is becoming quite dangerous at peak times and I suspect this will require traffic lights at some point before a serious accident occurs. We also know that Glaziers lane has been used as a "rat run" to the Hogs Back for large heavy goods vehicles and the road is just not suitable for that type and volume of traffic. Having met a HGV coming the other way on the railway bridge by Wanborough station on more than one occasion I can say from experience how frightening the experience is!

The weight of traffic entering Guildford, from all directions, as a result of the Local Plan proposals will greatly worsen what is already a standstill at peak times. The current road system cannot cope with current levels of traffic and much work needs to be completed before more traffic is introduced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to object to the local plan.

Despite the possible need for more houses to be built in this area, I believe that there are many disadvantages of this plan that far outweigh the benefits.

One of the main reasons I, along with many others, object to this plan, is that the increased number of houses will lead to higher levels of congestion. Even though more roads are being built congestion will still rise. This puts the safety of the children at local schools at higher risk. This backs up my argument as to why I object to the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Allowing Green Belt development to pay for transport schemes will simply generate yet more traffic from more homes, fuelling congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Policy I3 – Sustainable transport for new developments

I OBJECT. It is wishful thinking to imagine that many people will cycle from their new homes to the railway station. Most commuters will not wish to be wet, muddy and cold when they start or finish work and they will not be able to take much with them, for safety reasons. The roads are narrow, congested, poorly lit and poorly maintained, and are a hazard for cyclists. Shoppers will not cycle to the supermarket (how would they carry their shopping home? – or will they have it delivered, so adding to the traffic). The elderly would be unwise to cycle if they are at all unsteady or slow to react. Use of tricycles instead is hazardous – they are wider and less manoeuvrable.

Plans for a new railway station at Merrow (“Guildford East”) have been put forward and rejected many times in the past; there is no reason to suppose that it will be any different this time.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPP16/4047  Respondent: 10781729 / Sylvia Williams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am also worried about the impact from all the extra cars on our roads. Parking is already a problem in East Horsley where most of our shops are and the doctors surgery and the railway station. The area around Glenesk school in Ockham Road North is always a problem in the morning and I can envisage gridlock with all the extra traffic as this road is an important route to the A3 and M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13716  Respondent: 10782625 / Heather Alexander  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):

- Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
- Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
- Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. i.e. most residents!
- Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15321  Respondent: 10782689 / Murray Dudgeon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9130  Respondent: 10785633 / Penelope Eagle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8118  Respondent: 10793537 / Mr Michael Pattinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Vehicular traffic already places great burdens on local roads, in particular Ockham Road which is used by numerous heavy vehicles as a convenient cut through from the A3 to the A246. This should be discouraged since cars or lorries frequently need to mount footpaths in order to pass with consequent damage to gullies, verges and paths which are not designed for such loads and consequently break down. The hazards to pedestrians and cyclists are considerable. Any substantial increase in housing, and therefore residents and cars, will exacerbate an already dangerous situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15007  Respondent: 10796417 / Richard Shenton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary. My wife and I currently experience considerable traffic congestion on the A247 through Clandon and on the A3 between
Ripley and Guildford. Just in recent days this has caused us:
- To be late for work
- To be delayed returning home (including taking 30 minutes to travel the last mile home on the A247).
- To miss appointments
- To get caught in traffic jams on the A3 for routine shopping trips
- To lose a wing mirror, knocked off by a large truck passing through the narrow sections of the A247 in Clandon

The further substantial congestion that would be caused by the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield, Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Hill Farm is unacceptable and unsustainable.

In addition, we strongly oppose the proposed changes to the Green Belt and the insetting of villages. There are no specific exceptional circumstances to justify amendments to Green Belt boundaries. Proposed developments in supposedly protected areas are in breach of party manifesto commitments and contrary to previous responses to public consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15043  Respondent: 10796417 / Richard Shenton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/852  Respondent: 10798049 / Steve & Maureen Knight  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Support in principle (so long as any developments do not cross the green belt or flood plains)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/347  Respondent: 10799169 / Neal Basson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICY 13 Sustainable transport for new developments

OBJECT We support the concept of sustainable transport but object on the grounds that the practicalities have not been properly considered,

It is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable. Not everyone can cycle all the time.

How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process – the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle –and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a three hour commute add one hour to their journey from using park and rides?

The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a “hoppa bus” can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.

While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations (subject to negotiation with Network Rail) there could unintended consequences.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18393  Respondent: 10799169 / Neal Basson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT We support the concept of sustainable transport but object on the grounds that the practicalities have not been properly considered,

It is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable. Not everyone can cycle all the time.

How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process – the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle –and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a three hour commute add one hour to their journey from using park and rides?

The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a “hoppa bus” can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.

While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations (subject to negotiation with Network Rail) there could unintended consequences.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/483  Respondent: 10799169 / Neal Basson  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT We support the concept of sustainable transport but object on the grounds that the practicalities have not been properly considered,
It is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable. Not everyone can cycle all the time.
How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process – the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle – and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a three hour commute add one hour to their journey from using park and rides?
The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a “hoppa bus” can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.

While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations (subject to negotiation with Network Rail) there could unintended consequences.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17544  Respondent: 10799425 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Susan Parker)  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

We support the concept and aim but OBJECT on the grounds that the practicalities of sustainable transport have not been properly considered, it is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable. Not everyone can cycle all the time.

How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process - the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle – and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?
The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a hoppa bus can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.

Once again we see the word “expect” used which means the policy has no teeth. The word “expect” must be replaced with the word “require” so that this policy is enforceable.
There are a number of problems with this policy.

Congestion is a widely recognised factor in the local area of Guildford, and this is a major factor in the public response to the proposed housing numbers, which represents more than a 25% increase in housing numbers in a borough that is already profoundly congested. [Source: SHMA p61: itself sourced from ONS for 2013.] Residents recognise that to increase the population by this level within the existing transport provision is not feasible, and this informs much of the public response to the proposed level of housing accommodation.

It is not clear that this recognition, which is widespread through the borough, is shared by those who have drafted the Local Plan.

Guildford is a commuter town, which (compared to London) offers better quality of life and lower house prices, so it will continue to be a commuter town for the foreseeable future. As a result, access to the stations for commuting is of significance. It is not realistic to assume that traffic to stations for commuters can be replaced either by bus services (slow, intermittent, expensive, and in many cases absent completely) or by cycle. There is a capacity issue of car parking at the station, which effectively creates an absolute constraint on the feasibility of commuting from Guildford.

Cycling is attractive, and, for the urban young, especially students, it is both practical and cheap, and can be quick. However, as noted, those en route to work cannot be assumed to be able to cycle in working clothes. Elderly members of the community, those transporting small children, and the disabled cannot participate in cycling except to a limited extent. Effectively the "average" person deemed to be capable of cycling to substitute for car trips is an able-bodied adult not travelling to somewhere where smart clothing is required, not needing to arrive clean (or with showering facilities on arrival, not provided by all employers); this is not sufficiently widespread in terms of the local demographic for travellers that it should be allowed to determine policy – and of course, not needing to transport, for example, supermarket shopping after the trip. What about the disabled? the elderly? those looking after more than one child? Are they to be housebound? This is not a reasonable strategy. Before transport and buildings are determined on the basis of such a policy, it is also imperative that safe cycle routes are implemented through the borough. Cycling in winter on rural roads is inherently more dangerous. Upgrading these roads would not be feasible in terms of cost nor desirable in terms of local character.

Cycle lanes which disappear into normal traffic lanes, which travel over potholes and which allow cyclists to be threatened by HGVs are not conducive to wider cycle usage, nor should wider cycle usage be encouraged until it can be demonstrated that it is safe, which currently, locally, it is not. The A25 cycle corridor scheme (Part of LRN1) will exchange the risk between cyclists and vehicles sharing space for the risk between cyclists and pedestrians sharing space. Much of the A25 has no pedestrian area anyway outside the urban space. Many cyclists travel at high speed and they will be put into conflict with pedestrians including mothers with very young children and schoolchildren many of whom need to cross the road and hence cross the cycleway. This is likely to lead to accidents and pedestrians are being disadvantaged.

Road capacity reduces as average speeds come down due to congestion. Where proper cycle lanes or off-road lanes are not provided then it is inevitable that safe driving will lead to reduced average motor vehicle speeds and gap development in the traffic stream. Both these effects act to reduce the capacity of our local road network. This loss of capacity has not been recognised in the Transport Strategy.

The concept of the park and ride with access into the town limited for those who live outside the town, is similarly flawed. Park and Ride is expensive, cumbersome and slow. It should be noted that in Oxford it has had a disastrous impact on small local retailers which is a retail segment that it is important to retain and support.

Use of park and rides increases the use of the strategic road network by local users, which is not what it is designed to do.

This proposal is combined with aggressive exclusion from the town of those who are living in peripheral communities, which will increasingly resemble housing estates. This is a strategy for sink estates through Surrey instead of the Green Belt - this is not a strategy for growth. Head offices will choose to go elsewhere, because highly skilled staff and management in the cutting edge industries that GBC wants to encourage, will not choose to live in a dense housing estate.
The existing extent of traffic congestion has not been fully recognised. As a consequence the impact of the various
development scenarios has been understated and the infrastructure costs are an understatement.

The transport studies are incomplete and unpublished and this should have led to deferral of consideration of the Local
Plan consultation process until it was possible to revise the plan post publication of the studies. This matter was raised
by a number of councillors at the Full Council meeting on 24 May 2016 when the consultation was approved, but a
motion to defer was overturned by the majority party.

Cross-subsidy in terms of infrastructure is envisaged. The infrastructure deficit needs to be resolved before there are
large numbers of new residents exacerbating the current congestion. The funding of the new developments through CIL
and S 106 is expected to contribute to the transport impacts across the borough, and there is negligible concern for the
transport problems created within those new developments or in areas adjacent to them. This is not acceptable to existing
residents and is likely to cause some problems with the future residents too, who may arguably feel aggrieved that the
road funding associated with their developments is being subverted to other areas. While this may be permissible under
the revised CIL regulations it is questionable whether it is morally acceptable to grant planning permission to build on the
Green Belt in order to cross subsidise the building of roads or other infrastructure in the town centre or elsewhere across
the borough or outside it.

Insetting of villages and the proposed relaxation of planning restrictions anywhere outside settlements (Green Belt or
not), implied in P2, will lead to substantial infilling that will not require traffic assessment but will contribute a highly
significant amount of additional car journeys overall - by a more insidious process than the large developments proposed.

Costs for rail or bus travel could be substantially reduced and would incentivise their use; but these are outside the remit
of GBC and so cannot be encouraged by them.

It remains to be seen whether the proposed new stations will be delivered as they are not entirely within the council’s
control. While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations there could be unintended
consequences as the roads local to both sites are heavily congested. If parking facilities are inadequate this could lead to a
need for onerous parking restrictions on roads nearby – possibly affecting small businesses adversely.

If parking facilities are adequate this will encourage more traffic onto local roads and commuters tend to be hurrying to
catch a train or anxious to return home after a day at work. That does not bode well for the safety of pedestrians needing
to cross those roads. House prices near to stations tend to attract higher prices and this will increase the profit motive to
developers wanting to build on greenfield sites nearby. It will also mean that so-called affordable housing will be even
less affordable at these sites. It may also lead, over time, to an undesirable loss of social-rented housing in the vicinity. A
minor issue is that stopping at the additional stations will increase the train journey times to and from Guildford town
centre on the lines affected.

**Detail in Policy wording – flawed drafting:**

The policy begins and ends with the weak and totally ineffective word, in planning terms, “expect”.

Contributing through CIL will not necessarily address needs local to the development concerned, and created by it, but
may involve solving existing problems elsewhere in the Borough.

Bullets 4 & 5 – improvements to park and ride facilities imply increased car usage from outside the town and the parking
provision acknowledges that most journeys will be by car.

Bullet 6 - Has the Vehicle parking Supplementary Planning Document been published? It is not listed as key evidence but
the policy refers. How can a policy have been determined with reference to a non-existent part of the evidence base?

Bullets 7,8, 9 & 10 are weak & aspirational with let-out words such as “facilitate the use of”, “wherever possible”,
“contribute” and “where appropriate” (and poorly bulleted!). How will the use of ultra low emission vehicles be
facilitated? This is such a vague aspiration as to be meaningless.
The policy only “expects” new developments to contribute, demonstrate adequate provision, etc – it should enforce them. A transport statement AND assessment ought to be a fixed requirement – not a matter for negotiation – while the policy implies that this might be waived even for sites that generate significant amounts of movement.

The construction traffic, noise and pollution generated by meeting the proposed housing number will be excessive. It will have a highly significant impact on the amenity and health of those residents living close to the development sites and those who live on the routes that will be taken by the construction traffic.

The last paragraph says nothing new in planning terms but does mean that the Local Plan has not fully and properly considered the traffic impacts of the proposed sites. We have experience of how misleading the TAs produced by developers can be – using averaging techniques and understated baseline figures, days when schools are not operating and many other devices to pull the wool over the eyes of planning authorities. This aspect is a denial of responsibility by GBC. The result is that Green Belt and countryside will be released for development when fuller consideration of traffic impacts at the Local Plan stage should have prevented that. If the planning authority is taken in by developers’ TAs then wholly unsuitable developments will be permitted.

**Introduction:**

The spatial development strategy (paragraph 4.6.20 and Policy S2) does not address the development needs of the borough ensuring distances are practical; this is certainly not the case with all the development sites. For example, the Wisley airfield site will generate a massive increase in vehicle journeys; developments in West Horsley will lead to greater car use, as will the proposed developments at Garlick’s Arch and in Send. The obvious site choice for sustainable development would be on brownfield sites in the town but the Local Plan proposes allocating those sites to the declining retail industry instead.

Paragraph 4.6.21 suggests that sustainable transport is promoted. Far from providing sustainable transport this Plan will generate a massive increase in motor vehicle journeys. The Plan cannot force residents to ride bicycles or walk everywhere.

**Justification:**

Paragraph 4.6.22 seeks to set out a reasoned justification and alleges that development should offer real travel choice by sustainable transport modes. There is little sign that this is being taken seriously enough now.

Paragraph 4.6.23 proposed to bring forward a Vehicle Parking Supplementary Planning Document. It is not clear what to make of this. Failure to provide off-street vehicle parking will not prevent residents owning cars and finding somewhere else to park but it may make life difficult for key workers to commute to their place of work. How can a consultation take place relying on non-existent background documents which are key parts of the Evidence Base? How can anyone comment on non-existent documents, and even if brought forward part-way through the consultation, any comments will be prejudiced by the absence of this informing the start of the consultation.

Paragraph 4.6.24 refers to the Sustainable Movement Corridor. Bus services are aspirational but economic reality may mean that they fail to persist. There is not enough detail published on how the SMC will be delivered – suggesting that it is aspirational rather than fully thought through.

Paragraph 4.6.26 refers to reviewing existing transport facilities and likely transport generation as part of assessing the amount of incremental travel demand. That consideration should have taken place in a robust and detailed manner on a site-by-site basis before the sites were allocated in the Local Plan. It is not sufficient to leave that until the planning application stage as intended by GBC and SCC, given that all sites will be subject to “permission in principle” under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and so will not be capable of subsequent rejection on these grounds.

Paragraph 4.6.27 notes that Development must mitigate its transport impacts. The measures described rely entirely on people taking them up and not dumping their travel information packs in the nearest bin. It is clear that GBC, in response to concerns about elderly and disabled people failing to be coerced into riding bicycles are now suggesting tricycles to overcome this obstacle to their aspirations. They should be aware that while tricycles may help with balance issues they are heavier and harder to ride uphill. While the policy (unusually) notes that mitigation must be provided, in fact this is
then diluted to suggest that facilities for electric car charging points and encouragement to car-share can be sufficient; all are optional and therefore meaningless.

However well designed a development is it will make matters worse during construction and if on a greenfield site, it is hard to see how it will achieve environmental benefits. On the other hand, replacing inefficient buildings on a brownfield site could lead to benefits in the long term.

Paragraph 4.6.28 notes “Developers should have regard“ to the “Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C”. The only thing that developers have regard for is forcing their application through and maximising their profit – that is the business they are in. Appendix C is lacking in detail. It notes, for example that there will be new town centre bus facilities at a cost of £5-10 million – such vagueness make it clear that no real costing or analysis of proposals has been prepared, and that the Infrastructure improvements proposed have not been properly considered. Having regard to fluid and uncertain proposals is effectively meaningless as a constraint or a requirement.

Paragraph 4.6.29 requires that applications need to address the transport implications of the proposed development. Experience with recent planning applications suggests that developers will do everything in their power to understate transport impacts and we have no faith in GBC and SCC taking a sufficiently robust line on this.

Key Evidence is missing or inadequate.

The Strategic Transport Assessment (SCC 2016) is listed as “forthcoming”, but this plan has been produced in the absence of any strategic transport review.

There are further inadequacies in the Evidence Base, highlighted in the following annexes, which include examples of deficiencies, ambiguities and inadequacies in the transport and infrastructure evidence. This is not a comprehensive list of deficiencies, but serves as an illustration of the poor evidence on which decisions have been based.

Annexe 1

Comments on Guildford Borough Transport Study 2016

Page 2 – “address the historic infrastructure deficit” - developers are not required to do this?

Page 2 – It is wrong to claim that the cycle infrastructure along the A25 is good – and many cyclists are not careful, so putting them in contention with pedestrians is not a good idea.

Page 5 – The decision on Heathrow or Gatwick has yet to be taken but airport expansion in the south- east cannot be regarded as sustainable development and, although GBC has no control over such external decisions, its own growth agenda will drive a need for that expansion.

Page 6 An additional weakness is alternative “road closure diversion” routes for the SRN on the LRN

Page 6 Are the “Committed Improvements” actually committed and guaranteed to be delivered?

Page 7 The rail strategy does not provide for Wisley (residents would drive to stations)

Page 7 How long will it take to deliver Crossrail 2? “We hope that Crossrail 2 could be operational by 2030, but we are in the very early stages of planning and no decision to build it has been made.”

Page 7 Guildford platform capacity still many years away if ever.

Page 7 The rail strategy anticipates many improvements that have not been secured and may have unintended consequences if they proceed (see above)

Page 7 The Southern Rail Access to Heathrow [see the feasibility study dated December 2015 – although other proposals may be put forward (e.g. by Hounslow)] is still in its early stages and would have significant impacts on
open space beyond our Borough. For example, all options in the feasibility study would use Staines Moor SSSI and Option 4 would use Bedfont Lakes Country Park (a Local Nature Reserve and SNCI).

The various options would use existing commercial, residential and highways land in varying degrees. It seems unlikely that a solution will be delivered within the Plan period and removal of highly valued open space with high biodiversity (wherever it is in South-east England) cannot be regarded as sustainable.

Page 10 and 13 There is a stark contrast between the plans for the town centre which involve encouraging a reduction in traffic by reducing roadspace and the plans for the SRN and parts of the LRN which involve increasing capacity. While increasing capacity may reduce some areas of congestion in the short term, history suggests that traffic will rapidly grow until the improved roads are congested once again. This can hardly be regarded as sustainable. A sustainable option would be to apply a very substantial traffic infrastructure constraint on the housing number.

Page 10 While the A3 Guildford Tunnel aspiration has some environmental advantages over widening (in particular for residents living close to the A3), the environmental burden of the construction phase will be far higher and aspects such as location of ventilation stacks and their local effect (in all weather conditions) do not appear to have been considered.

Page 14 Under Weaknesses the point about A roads in Guildford Town also applies to surrounding areas in the Borough and beyond. The anticipated improvements ignore existing congestion to the south and east of Guildford – presumably because SCC’s transport assessment methodology only identifies the tip of the iceberg. The current Plan will see increased congestion and a resultant reduction in air quality in many areas beyond the town centre.

Page 16 “Largely commercial bus services” is seen as a strength whereas it should be seen as a weakness with a trend to reduced subsidies and the provision of bus services, especially in rural areas, being increasingly dependent on commercial gain. It is difficult to see this changing under the current Government cuts philosophy. The point “Subject to business case including funding” under Aspirations demonstrates this point.

Page 18 We welcome the aspiration to “Expand the public realm through significantly extended pedestrian-priority areas”

Page 19 Guildford is well behind other areas in monitoring air quality let alone attempting to reduce it.

The introduction talks about reductions in some pollutants. This may be the case for pollutants such as Sulphur Dioxide, which contributed to the visible London smogs, but it is not true of diesel vehicle emissions which have increased as a result of Government policy including its aggressive growth agenda and population increase through immigration.

30 accessible electric vehicle charging points are only an aspiration and will be nowhere near enough if there is a real shift to electric vehicles.

It is clear from the “Strategy outcomes” that GBC would prefer not to follow other areas in pro-actively tackling air quality.

Page 22/23/24 The timescales indicate that the main rail improvements (Including the two new stations) are unlikely to be delivered until the end of the Plan period or even later. The sites that are supposedly justified by their inclusion will generate a major increase in road traffic in the interim and it may be more difficult to achieve this aspect of modal shift in the longer term. The same can be said about the other traffic infrastructure proposals. Residential development is being scheduled before the infrastructure that it will need.

Page 24 Monitoring – “Increase” needs to be in proportion to population growth as otherwise failure will taken as success. “An Increase in average vehicle speeds” is inconsistent with the desire to reduce the number of persons killed or seriously injured. For example, some A roads pass through residential areas where pedestrians, including schoolchildren, are trying to cross the road at peak times. It is noted that increase in vehicle speeds is only desired in the morning. Going home from work does not seem to matter!

Annexe 2
NPPF and NPPG The Plan ignores the points concerning Green Belt and protecting the environment. GBC have tried to get round this by spinning their messages and using misleading statistics including a major understatement of the area of Green Belt to be removed.

Planning Update (March 2015) – The point in this update concerning Green Belt has been ignored

Monitoring Indicators:

· Ten years is far too long to wait for information on whether the approach is working or not. The target requires only an increase. This would permit an increase less than that in line with any population growth to be regarded as success. The bar has been set well within the failure range.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13433  Respondent: 10800065 / David Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4908  Respondent: 10800673 / Nigel Rowland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO THE IMPACT ON THE INFRASTRUCTURE AROUND THE VILLAGES

• I OBJECT to the impact of the Local plan on the local infrastructure. The roads around Send and Ripley are already congested and cannot cope with the current needs. The Local Plan does not incorporate a detailed transport infrastructure strategy that would demonstrate how the road network would support the additional pressure on the roads and other amenities if the proposed development went ahead. The plans to improve the A3 are years off (2025 – 30) and, even if they were implemented, would be preceded by years of gridlock on the local roads. Plans to improve local roads (ref LRN20, specifically Send Road and Send Barns Lane) through an investment of £1.5m will be woefully inadequate to cope with the increased traffic. Additionally, increased traffic through the villages will increase the hazards along the main roads, particularly pedestrians, especially children (using the Send School or catching buses to Guildford schools) and the increasing number of cyclists. This will be exacerbated by HGVs accessing the planned industrial units at Garlick’s Arch.

• I OBJECT to Policy A43a (Land for North facing slip roads to/from A3 at send Marsh/Burnt Common) This would necessitate a 4-way junction at Burnt Common and would inevitably increase the amount of traffic using the local roads in Send. This junction would worsen the problem of drivers using Send as a cut through from
Guildford to Woking on local roads that are just not intended for this purpose. As a resident, I am amazed that there hasn’t yet been a serious accident as drivers use Potters Lane for just this purpose with little regard for the 30mph speed limit.

- I OBJECT to the proposed development of Gosden Hill Farm (Policy A25) and its inevitable impact on the roads around Send. Despite assurances of an additional railway station, commuters will utilise the opportunity to leave the A3 at the existing Burnt Common roundabout and travel on the faster Woking to Waterloo line, rather than use the slower Guildford line.

- I OBJECT to the proposed developments opposite Winds Ridge (policy A44) and Clockbarn Nursery (policy A42) due to the impact that the additional traffic will have on small local roads. The first of these will increase the traffic leaving Send Hill onto Potters Lane at what is already a dangerous junction on very narrow lanes. Meanwhile, Send Road is already frequently blocked by HGVs trying to turn into Tannery Lane; this can only be made worse by additional traffic using the same road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16490  Respondent: 10802689 / Ann Summersgill  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The reason for objecting are that the local roads, including the A3 and M25 are already too congested and the proposed development will add further to the current level of congestion and pollution. The smaller roads through West Clandon, Ripley and Send cannot cope with the increased level of traffic that such developments will bring.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7666  Respondent: 10803297 / John Collomosse  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the impact on air quality that both the Wisely development and the Garlick’s Arch development will have

I object to the developments in Ripley and Send also on the grounds on air quality which is sure to be harmed by the massive influx of traffic from 2500 homes in the area which will likely bring about 5000 cars to the area. This will be particularly acute in Ripley – a village of only around 2000 people, you are tripling the size of without any supporting road infrastructure leaving stationary grid-lock e.g. on the Ripley High Street where I live, no doubt reducing the already poor air quality.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/836  Respondent: 10804961 / M. Basson  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11766</th>
<th>Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The large developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to increased congestion and to higher levels of air pollution. This will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12428</th>
<th>Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The large developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to increased congestion and to higher levels of air pollution. This will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health, thereby further increasing pressure on what will limited local facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)**

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Firstly, my wife and I together with many local friends and neighbours are hugely shocked and dismayed at the sheer extent of the proposed developments across the various sites in our immediate area; quite apart from the massive implications to the old Wisley airfield site which will also affect our villages. This last matter seems to have been raised again, notwithstanding your reservations.**

We have lived in West Horsley for 34 years, schooled our children locally and have both worked locally too. We are members of various local care related organisations and commit much of our spare time to local charities as well as our Church. You could say that we have invested many years of time and energy into the well being of our local community, which we value hugely.

The proposed several developments of some 533 (plus a recent add-on of 60) houses together with 2100 houses plus service/leisure businesses at Wisley, is quite out of proportion to the nature of this area and far outside the scope of the the existing and developable infrastructure of roads, water services, drainage, schooling, medi-care. local amenities and the huge increase in traffic demands it would create. Roads and the narrow lanes serving the area, drainage and the other services are already at maximum capacity.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

I wish to object to the proposals laid down in the local plan:
We cannot absorb the population resulting from the planned development/s because:

The road system is at present stretched to accommodate traffic from the M25/A3/Ripley to Woking, using Sendmarsh Road and Send Road. The proposal of 400 houses & industrial units will mean the road to Woking will be permanently grid-locked and the condition of the roads will deteriorate. Traffic will use the roads which have proved they frequently need repairing now and so be a greater strain on Guildford financial sources.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
11. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6872  Respondent: 10816673 / G Hall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Traffic generation from the proposed new housing estates will be considerable. Most households in rural areas as a necessity have 2 cars, many having 3. Journey times on local roads will increase significantly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1654  Respondent: 10816705 / Maggie Cole  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plans for improvements. You cannot squeeze modern traffic down lanes that were built for a horse and cart.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no pedestrian footpaths. The new homes will generate dangerous and unsustainable traffic. The historic village of Ripley was given a by-pass to save it for future generations not make its roads into a car park.

Every time there is a problem on the A3/M25 traffic already congests the area to dangerous levels. With the increasing cycle traffic on the Olympic cycle route to the Surrey Hills using the same narrow lanes, this is a recipe for a human disaster.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4210  Respondent: 10816865 / William Adrian Watson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The sites planned for development, approx 533 homes, put increasing pressure upon a stressed infrastructure. The villages in the area cannot cope with the infrastructure at present, never mind increased numbers of children in our schools, increased traffic on our picturesque country lanes, increased medical needs etc, the list is endless. This is a sure sign of the first step toward urbanisation, the people that live in the area are here to get away from that.

To even consider sites within this historic and scenic Surrey countryside is a travesty.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12233  **Respondent:** 10816993 / Jane Roberts  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1159  **Respondent:** 10818529 / John Hales  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also appalled at the deterioration in local roads over the last 5-7 years along with the congestion that already exists which will only decline further with the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13947  **Respondent:** 10822913 / Karen Dougherty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The creation of more housing will impact on the: 

Roads - already in a bad state of repair; congested (frequently the 5 minute drive through Ripley from the A3 takes 15/20 minutes due to the increased traffic through the bottle neck in the village; Send has similar issues); unpassable due to increases in cars who then park on roadsides restricting traffic flow on side roads and severe traffic congestion on the A3 around the M25 and Guildford.

Public transport - trains overcrowded

Doctors/dental surgeries/hospitals - demand for appointments; treatment and operations will increase with the influx of new residents to the area but which is currently under pressure.

Policing/emergency services - the local Police station in Ripley and Woking fire station has closed; an increase in local population would necessitate more emergency service cover - will this be factored in? If so who will pay?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel...
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5825  Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object because of poor air quality concerns

Because of the massive developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, there will be much greater congestion on the roads which in turn will lead to poorer air quality. This will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16679  Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object because of poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Because of the massive developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, there will be much greater congestion on the roads which in turn will lead to poorer air quality. This will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1052  Respondent: 10837217 / Gillian Dobb-Ponds  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The roads around this area are crowded enough also car parking at stations are full. The M25 is grid locked at least once a week, I drive over it going to Cobham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
## Comment ID: PSLPP16/174  
**Respondent:** 10839009 / Jacky Fenton  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I strongly OBJECT to a 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. This would mean the Send Road (A247), would become a through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3 and also the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham which would leave it gridlocked all day long and not just at rush hour!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

## Comment ID: PSLPP16/8133  
**Respondent:** 10840929 / R.E. Reed  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the latest version of Guildford borough council proposal because the access to these fields is already a heavily congested country lane and also because the access to these said fields is not sufficiently wide to accommodate an entrance and exit to these said fields, side by side.

These were my objection to the previous GBC local plan and they are not altered.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

## Comment ID: PSLPP16/6935  
**Respondent:** 10844353 / Julia Wood  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

3) I object due to the congestion on the roads. There is already a lot of traffic coming through Ripley, which is often at a standstill at rush hour. The Wisley Airfield development alone would add an awful lot of traffic as the potential residents would need their cars to go to Horsley and Woking stations and to go to London. The roads in the area are too narrow to cope.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

## Comment ID: PSLPP16/6940  
**Respondent:** 10844353 / Julia Wood  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
5) I object due to the congestion on the main roads (A3 and M25). Wisley Airfield, Garlick's Arch and Gosden Hill developments would add to the already congested roads.

6) I object due to poor air quality concerns. The developments mainly at the North East of the borough would create more congestion and increased air pollution which would be very detrimental to people's health.

I hope you will take my objections into account.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6385  Respondent: 10845377 / Natasha Lock  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

| TRAFFIC AND PARKING |

Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected.

Local Road Network:

In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6390  Respondent: 10845377 / Natasha Lock  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

| Transport: |

Congestion on the roads and parking at the station will be a challenge as I'll trying to get on the train during peak times.
I strongly object the planned development of our villages and believe that a more up to date and sympathetic plan should be proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10850  
Respondent: 10845569 / Stu Edwards  
Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

lack of parking in the village for the present day users let alone if more were to be housed

dangerous size vehicals manoeuvring in roads that has little or no pedestrian path way due to increased traffic

increased traffic that would be cause in which a village such as Ripley already cannot sustain its current demand without long tailback and

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14494  
Respondent: 10846625 / Frank Drennan  
Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

1.1 I object to policy I3 “Sustainable transport for new developments” on the grounds that;

1.2 This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

1.3 The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

1.4 The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.
1.5 The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day, as I used to do. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

1.6 Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

1.7 The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. In addition any vessel would have to negotiate a number of locks to travel any significant distance. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

1.8 The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8005  Respondent: 10847713 / Gillian Cox  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The local roads in the Guildford Area are already at capacity, especially the A3 and need major work on them to keep the traffic flowing. This should be the Council's priority before any new developments are envisaged. Any new developments in the Ripley, Burpham, Send and Wisley areas will result in the A3 becoming totally clogged (even with the suggested new slip roads at Burnt Common and Railway Station at Merrow) and vehicles being unable to move in peak times which will have a knock-on effect for local businesses and freight companies losing money because of delays. The frustrated drivers will then decide to avoid the A3 and take to the declassified roads which are not designed for high levels of traffic. Remember for every house built there will be on average 2 cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1777  Respondent: 10848513 / Martin Cole  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25

The A3 and M25 would need to be improved before any development can be considered. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no enhancements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield, Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Hill should not take place.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4263  Respondent: 10851585 / Mike Coope-Mitchell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the Guildford Plan, specifically the plans for West and East Horsley.

My overall objection is the strain on the existing infrastructure, including any upgrades as part of the Plan.

The density of the proposed developments will be significantly greater than anywhere now which is already severely overstretched at rush hour and school times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9803  Respondent: 10853249 / Evan Parry-Morris  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Parking issues in local villages caused by a larger population

Parking in local villages is already an issue. It is frequently impossible to find parking in Ripley if you require to stay for more than two hours. I object to the proposals as further development around our villages will only make the situation worse.

Congestion on the trunk roads, A3/M25

The A3 and M25 already suffer from severe congestion during rush hours, in addition, Highways England have no plans to improve the A3 prior to 2020. I object to the development of these sites shown in the local plan because trunk roads would be unable to cope.

Congestion on local village roads and lanes

Many of the villages are suffering from severe congestion, for example the Shell roundabout at Burnt Common, and the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in Ripley. I object to the further development which will cause further congestion in and around our villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7178  Respondent: 10854113 / Sarah Pickering  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
WE OBJECT due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

I object to this policy, as it is too vague and optimistic. Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network (about 3,000 private cars from the 2,100 new homes at Wisley Airfield alone).

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7180  Respondent: 10854113 / Sarah Pickering  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

WE OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/656  Respondent: 10854241 / Sian Holwell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It is totally unacceptable to even contemplate the development of houses/industrial units at Wisley Airfield, Garlicks Arch and Gosden Hill Farm. Whilst it is anticipated the plan will ensure sufficient health care and schooling is in place it is totally obvious to any user of the local roads during peak rush hour (both morning and evening) that the A3 and M25
cannot cope NOW and I don't see how widening these roads is going to improve the situation or adding an extra junction just create more accidents and more delays when trying to exit the A3 for the M25.

This current plan is flawed and needs to be put in the bin. A sensible plan considering current residents, the environment, what is achievable with the major infrastructure needs to be developed. It is not just about the profits that can be made by companies.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2171  **Respondent:** 10855553 / Emma Tallick  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

11. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14639  **Respondent:** 10857249 / Alice Pashley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

I have particular concerns about the growth in traffic on our already overburdened roads, in particular the A3, which is frequently gridlocked at peak times, and the A247, which despite its A road status is too narrow to allow for two large vehicles to pass each other. Only last week I witnessed the aftermath of an accident on the A247 and another near-accident in the same place. The unsustainable increase in housing numbers will add to the traffic in a way which the roads cannot cope with.

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I PART SUPPORT, PART OBJECT to this policy

I support the concept and aim but OBJECT on the grounds that the practicalities of sustainable transport have not been properly considered.

A central bus station and shuttle bus service in the town centre are essential for existing development and are crucial before any new development.

While I welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations, there could be unintended consequences.

I object to the local plan as it will increase congestion on road infrastructure that can’t cope

The area has too much road traffic at present, and the rural roads are in poor condition through overweight traffic (lorries and coaches) damaging the surface, particularly evident in our local area along East Lane, and the Drift, Horsley.

An increase in housing as proposed will lead to a substantial increase in cars, and in turn traffic. Leading to congestion, increased traffic noise, traffic pollution, increased accidents and a detrimental effect to the environment both physical and social.

Parking at both Effingham and Horsley Train Stations is currently at capacity, with no room for further parking during peak hours.

I object due to the congestion that the actual development will cause
Before any development can commence, trunk roads and access routes to the areas would need to be improved to enable the access of vehicles.

There are no such plans for the A3 and M25 and the local rural roads can't handle the construction traffic.

**I object due to insufficient plans for meeting commuter needs**

Without a regular bus network, footpaths, cycle ways, sufficient train frequency, increased road network, then the proposed plan will not be able to accommodate the needs to commute.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/18611  **Respondent:** 10858977 / Angela Otterson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object** to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments

This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day, as I used to do. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.
The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/16043</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10859553 / MARK Curtis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY I3 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments. This is another aspirational policy, not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

I like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented. Ie. Cost of housing will increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/11828  Respondent: 10863969 / Joanne Rooke  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1607  Respondent: 10865537 / Edwina Fassom  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10908  Respondent: 10866721 / Andy Court  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Congestion on the trunk roads, A3/M25
I object to the development of the strategic sites due to A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.

Congestion on the local village roads and lanes
Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. I object to further development which will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.

Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic
Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
## Poor air quality concerns

Further congestion, particularly in built-up residential areas will only lead to greater levels of air pollution. I object to further development, which will result in a fall in the air quality.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/10909   **Respondent:** 10866721 / Andy Court   **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

## Sites being planned in unsustainable locations

Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

**Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population**

Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. To which I object.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/11687   **Respondent:** 10868609 / Robert Lockie   **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the proposal for building in Send as Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day and Send would be a through route for traffic to Woking from the M25 to the A3. This would also have a major impact on Old Woking with its narrow roundabout and roads.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/11698   **Respondent:** 10868609 / Robert Lockie   **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to what is being proposed for roads as it is in no way definite and cannot be the way to solve the A3 problems.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9787</th>
<th>Respondent: 10871329 / Lyn Gargan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly object to the fact that our roads already are fit to bursting at least twice daily, during the rush hours. The A3 is constantly blocked at the turn off to Guildford Town, the two lanes at the Wooden Bridge section are also constantly blocked and can take extended time to complete a simple journey. Having had to attend the Royal Surrey County Hospital for cancer treatment on a regular basis, this stretch of road became a nightmare journey for me, never knowing what time to leave and if I would get there for my appointments.

I object strongly to lack of the Guildford Planning Department and Local Plan developers to understand and take action on the A3 access to the M25 at Wisley, to the most heavily used section of this orbital motorway. How on earth do they propose to add a 25% increase in the homes and the traffic that that will bring to this section alone?

I strongly object to the increase in pollution that will be generated by the increase in traffic using, already crowded roads, to access the new A3 at Burnt Common.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16431</th>
<th>Respondent: 10876033 / Lucie Paulson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to policy I3 - doesn't consider poor state of current rural roads with potholes, broken edges and flooding. Rose Lane in Ripley has recurring potholes, worse since HGVs coming down more regularly. - relying on public transport is only possible when there is a reliable regular service to multiple destinations. A bus to one or two destinations a few times a day does not actually provide for the majority of residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13673</th>
<th>Respondent: 10877153 / Carol Ann Cullen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that the increase in pollution has not been properly considered. The large increase in the volume of traffic will only increase pollution.
Horsley Railway station car park is already operating on full during weekdays. With the increased number of houses in both East & West Horsley and in Ockham, most of these people will be using Horsley Railway station. Where are they all going to park?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

The small parade of shops near the Bell & Colville garage only has a tiny amount of parking spaces. This area is frequently very congested with lorries making deliveries and/or cars parked there. The road around here is VERY narrow and this causes much congestion for traffic to/from the A246. There is also no room for the road to be widened along this stretch. The roads will NOT be able to cope with substantially increased traffic.

• Parking at the shops in East Horsley for the shops and Public Library is already difficult currently. How is the village going to accommodate the extra people and cars from the proposed substantial increased housing?

Until you come up with a fully considered plan for the infrastructure to serve the proposed increased population, what you propose is just totally unsustainable and everything WILL come to a grinding halt and NOTHING will function. Will you take personal responsibility for this then?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. Roads Must BE Widened

Lorries, buses and cars are now much wider than they used to be about 20 years ago. The roads were adequate then but they are NOT wide enough now!!! We are also sharing the roads with cyclists who are consistently now cycling 2 or 3 abreast. As there is full encouragement for people to cycle, then there must be proper provision for cycle/pedestrian
pathways/lanes. On a recent occasion, there was a group of cyclists cycling three abreast and there were 15 of them cycling as a group altogether. It meant that it was impossible to overtake such a group of cyclists safely. Many motorists are now overtaking cyclists on a bend without being able to see if the road is actually clear! On one occasion, I was unfortunate enough to experience a Police car overtaking a single cyclist on a bend and if I had not braked in time, I would have been in an accident with a Police car!

1. Full Bus Services Must Be Put Into Place

Horsley railway station car park is nearly full up every day now. Where are the parking spaces for the increased number of people living in the additional housing in Wisley, Ockham, and East & West Horsley going to be located? On the other hand, if a bus service is to be provided, this must run frequently, say every 10/15 mins during very peak times and every 20 mins during very early mornings and late evenings for this to work.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6677  Respondent: 10878433 / John Townsend  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the large proposed development of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6684  Respondent: 10878433 / John Townsend  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11018  Respondent: 10878977 / Lisbet Hjort Jensen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPP16/6529  Respondent: 10879457 / Louisa Scott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that the infrastructure has not been considered and is inadequate to deal with the proposed housing levels and additional traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13268  Respondent: 10881217 / Ben Stevens  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A few years ago when I was at school in Burpham, a local 10 minute journey would frequently be disrupted by traffic on the Send Road, the A3 and also the slip road into Burpham. Even though we would leave extra time for rush hour traffic, the smallest of incidents would mean this journey time could creep up to three or four times as long. The local bus companies will confirm this as students on the buses were let off detentions as it became such a common complaint. The only time that traffic does improve is during holiday periods and the Summer months when fewer students are in school because of exam study leave. This means that demands on the roads are not as high but of course this is only for a short time during the year.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18206  Respondent: 10883201 / Danny McHugh  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/1106  Respondent: 10884993 / Dave Fassom  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7653  Respondent: 10885633 / Catherine Jackson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to all this additional housing as the traffic on Send Road is heavy enough and there is a lack of provision for safe crossing on this road and a lack of speed control making it dangerous, particularly for children, who wish to cross this road to utilise the park facility. More houses will mean more traffic and increased risks to our children.

I object to 13,860 houses being built on the Green Belt along the A3 because it will cause gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6853  Respondent: 10889985 / Ruth Macdonald  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to considerable further congestion despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I also OBJECT to this proposal on the grounds of the impact of the increased traffic on the area. Already the area is gridlocked in the morning & evening rush hour & the new plans will create even more of a cut through to Woking.

The local roads going through Send & Ripley will not be able to cope & there is no room to widen the roadways.

It will add to congestion.

I also OBJECT due to the environmental impact and pollution to the area. This proposal does not take such an environmental impact into sufficient consideration.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6955  Respondent: 10895137 / Katrina Broughton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7108  Respondent: 10896065 / Georgia Bean  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Pollution: I strongly object to the new draft plan proposing additional 2000 homes at Wisley, 2000 at Gosden Hill Farm, nearly 600 in The Horsleys and 400 at Garlicks Arch as it will have a great impact on the local road network which at peak times is already struggling. The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment - already a cause for concern in several areas in the borough. Additional noise and air pollution will be inevitable with this increase in traffic and it will have a significant impact on our environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8616  Respondent: 10900257 / Mark Norman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to Guildford Borough Council’s Local Plan June 2016 as I believe its is unsound an far too aspirational.
I believe the order and timing of the proposals around housing, transport and infrastructure are incorrect.

Transport A3

Transport should be the first decision to be taken. This should first be about the A3, how the volume of traffic southbound at the Burpham turnoff can be handled as well as elevating the traffic jams on the A3 through Guildford. The proposed tunnel entrance would sit on the Gosden Hill site. By allowing housing to be built on this site before the decision on the A3 would remove this key tunnel entrance site for relieving the traffic through the whole of Guildford.
London Road Burpham

The designation of the London Road as a sustainable movement corridor to have a dedicated bus lane and cycle lane is not appropriate. I suggest that you come and look at the road at rush hour, it crawls along and with increased development the traffic will only get worse. Even if it were flowing the road width is constrained, how 4 lanes could be incorporated is beyond belief.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attacked documents:

I object to increases in traffic as the air quality will be compromised and will have a bad effect on residents who already have breathing problems and it may actually increase the amount of people suffering in the future. I also object to this because the local doctor's surgery may not be able to cope with a large influx of new patients from new housing developments - on occasions it is difficult to get an appointment for several days.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attacked documents:

I object to the Plan because of concerns about poor air quality (Policy I3)

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly close to the A3, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.
The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12742</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10910625 / Alyson Blackwell</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object that housing being proposed on the Green Belt will increase traffic bringing increased danger and pollution and slower journey times on our already overcrowded village roads and surrounding areas.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12155</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10910753 / Heather Thompson</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. Pollution is already unacceptably high in this area with emissions from the A3 and M25</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11123</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10911425 / Andrew Gray</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</strong> The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to the impact of further congestion on local village roads and lanes.

I object to the impact of excessive development on the A3 and M25 on air quality. The air quality in many parts of the borough is greater than EU permitted levels and will damage the health of residents and future residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Pollution from traffic fumes and noise will be detrimental to the health of the people of Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

POLICY I3 – Sustainable transport for new developments

I OBJECT to this impractical plan which does not reflect the realities of life and the extent of inherent issues that exist within the current infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Pollution: I strongly object to the new draft plan proposing additional 2000 homes at Wisley, 2000 at Gosden Hill Farm, nearly 600 in The Horsleys and 400 at Garlicks Arch as it will have a great impact on the local road network which at peak times is already struggling. The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and
particulates in the environment - already a cause for concern in several areas in the borough. Additional noise and air pollution will be inevitable with this increase in traffic and it will have a significant impact on our environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16549  Respondent: 10918977 / Gillian Lachelin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the threats which the proposal poses to Ockham and surrounding villages. There is no way that the small local roads could cope with the huge increase in traffic which would be caused by the development. There are already severe problems on the A3 and M25 every day with frequent accidents and the pollution levels are extremely high. The trains are already overcrowded and it can be impossible to park at Horsley station during the day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12866  Respondent: 10920065 / Roz Tacon  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thirdly, we are particularly concerned that the infrastructure proposals are inadequate even to meet the needs of what is there at the moment, let alone the proposed developments in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16105  Respondent: 10920865 / Sebastian Forbes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There are, as you must know, a number of places that simply cannot take existing traffic safely, let alone more traffic after more house-building.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4911  Respondent: 10920961 / Mark Stevens  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11876</th>
<th>Respondent: 10921633 / Emma Loosley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I particularly object to the idea that the plan will being to effectively merge all the villages along the A3 from the M25 to the Hogs Back. It will destroy the open amenity of the borough and further congest the A3. This road is regularly a source of gridlock and this already has a detrimental effect on surrounding roads as vehicles search to find alternative routes. As a resident in Send I regularly witness major traffic hold-ups on the Send Road which acts as a link between Guildford and the A3 and Woking. The photos are a typical sight during rush hour in Send NOW and will only get worse.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12072</th>
<th>Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14448</th>
<th>Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13) The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7537  Respondent: 10923265 / Colin Lewis  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Traffic in the village and surrounding areas is heavily congested with a volume of vehicles through the village damaging road surfaces and too heavy for small country roads to cope with. They were certainly not built to carry 32 ton trucks which constantly damage trees and roadside vegetation because of their size and height.

(Rail bridge was hit by a large lorry recently causing closure of Ockham Road through the village for several days, not for the first time).

The A3 and the B246 Guildford/Leatherhead Road for example, are almost daily at a standstill, as is the M25 intersection at Junction 10.

Parking in East Horsley has become impossible with no scope to ease the problem.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11338  Respondent: 10923297 / Matthew Burnham  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):

• Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
• Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
• Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. I.e. most residents!
• Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16658</th>
<th>Respondent: 10923745 / Marwan Khalek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3. This will severely impact the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16664</th>
<th>Respondent: 10923745 / Marwan Khalek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The large proposed development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the above provides you with sufficient information to properly consider and take into account all my objections individually and collectively and that the Council would see fit to withdraw these plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13120</th>
<th>Respondent: 10924609 / H Perryman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the congestion that development will cause to local roads. There is little room to increase capacity on either the A3 or the M25 which are both already congested during peak hours. More than 5,000 new houses are proposed in the 5 miles between Burpham and the M25, which could result in some 10,000 more cars using the A3. Also, there is little capacity (nor any plans) to widen the local minor roads to ease the congestion. The proposed new development sites, particularly those at Wisley, Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Hill, will make the situation much worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8198</th>
<th>Respondent: 10927201 / David Pinder</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments**

I have not seen any proposals for new or improved transport infrastructure as a result of these developments. The obvious conclusion is that there will be a huge increase in motor traffic on village roads as a result of the new developments. As a motorist this will lead to a significant increase in journey times and no doubt the problems we already have with potholes will only get worse. As a cyclist (I cycle to and from Horsley station most days) I worry about the impacts on road safety given our roads are generally quite narrow and poorly lit. As a resident I worry about increased noise and air pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9013  **Respondent:** 10928737 / Guy Pashley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3823  **Respondent:** 10928769 / John Slatford  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• There are already far too many problems with traffic and congestion within the Borough and, seemingly, nothing in the Plan to deal with the inevitable increase resulting from the plans for new housing and population.

Finally, I am extremely worried about the apparent plan to merge all of our villages along the A3 and the resultant effects this will have upon our respective communities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11324  **Respondent:** 10930945 / Peter Perry  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• There are already far too many problems with traffic and congestion within the Borough and, seemingly, nothing in the Plan to deal with the inevitable increase resulting from the plans for new housing and population.

Finally, I am extremely worried about the apparent plan to merge all of our villages along the A3 and the resultant effects this will have upon our respective communities.
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
The huge developments being proposed will lead to considerably increased congestion and to greater levels of air pollution. This will have a serious detrimental effect on local residents and their health, particularly in the North East of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1725  Respondent: 10933793 / Julia Tilbury  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I3 - Sustainable transport for new developments

I OBJECT . This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general "modal shift" from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent - just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough's residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust.

One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day, as I used to do. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.
Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1697  Respondent: 10933857 / C J Tilbury  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I3 - Sustainable transport for new developments

I object. This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general "modal shift" from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent - just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough's residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust.

One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day, as I used to do. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.
Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11182  Respondent: 10934433 / Ömer and Sally Kirsan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure is not in place that in any way deals with the amount of houses and commercial development being proposed in the Compton area and its surrounds. We are referring in particular to the B3000, A3 and A31. These roads are already at saturation point. They not only deal with local traffic, but also traffic, passing through to get to the West Country, Dover, London, Dorking and the Coast. An ever-increasing number of heavy goods vehicles using the B3000 have to pass over a narrow Victorian railway bridge causing difficulties for cars coming the other way and great danger to pedestrians or anyone on a bicycle.

Access proposed to some of the developments envisaged will also create congestion around the Business Park causing serious problems for ambulances to the Royal Surrey County Hospital, and also push more traffic though Compton by coming off the A3 at Compton and then using Down Lane to access Guildford or the proposed development.

Pollution on the B3000, which is already very high and not being addressed, will increase if further traffic is put on this road.

Research upon which assumptions have been made is often out of date. Traffic in this area steadily increases every year without the huge developments being imposed on the area without proper forethought.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15382  Respondent: 10935201 / Cathryn Walton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT. This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.
The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every 10-15 minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus in favour of state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust.

One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4 knots, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been sufficiently worked out.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13990  Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the impact of excessive development on the A3 and M25 on air quality. The air quality in many parts of the borough is greater than EU permitted levels and will damage the health of residents and future residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16128  Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the impact of excessive development on the A3 and M25 on air quality. The air quality in many parts of the borough is greater than EU permitted levels and will damage the health of residents and future residents.
2. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are designated on Green Belt land along the A3. This will result in gridlock on the A3, the A247 and the surrounding roads which are already at capacity.
3. I object to the inadequate protection of the environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16131  Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the impact of further congestion on local village roads and lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8004  Respondent: 10941153 / Michael Cox  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The local roads in the Guildford Area are already at capacity, especially the A3 and need major work on them to keep the traffic flowing. This should be the Council's priority before any new developments are envisaged. Any new developments in the Ripley, Burpham, Send and Wisley areas will result in the A3 becoming totally clogged (even with the suggested new slip roads at Burnt Common and Railway Station at Merrow) and vehicles being unable to move in peak times which will have a knock-on effect for local businesses and freight companies losing money because of delays. The frustrated drivers will then decide to avoid the A3 and take to the declassified roads which are not designed for high levels of traffic. Remember for every house built there will be on average 2 cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9317  Respondent: 10943457 / Henry Benzikie  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the
north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9318</th>
<th>Respondent: 10944161 / Stephen Benzikie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/671</th>
<th>Respondent: 10944513 / Amber Ellis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6470</th>
<th>Respondent: 10949921 / Jan Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13) The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy 12) Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place. Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17898  **Respondent:** 10952193 / Chrissie Beard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooprate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

All minor and major roads in the area are seriously congested.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17900  **Respondent:** 10952193 / Chrissie Beard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooprate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

During morning and evening commuter times the A3 resembles a car park and the road could not cope with extra traffic

Commuter train services to and from London and Guildford, cannot cope with the current numbers of commuters, despite the platform having been extended

Local bus services are almost non existent

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3057  **Respondent:** 10952705 / Moira Maidment  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooprate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15815  Respondent: 10953249 / Charlotte Ladd  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8812  Respondent: 10953921 / Alan Knox  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16737  Respondent: 10956161 / Pauline McCallister  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10606  Respondent: 10956865 / Annette Parkin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My next objection is to the impact on the road network that is already at breaking point. As the building work is planned to continue over a period of years there will be a constant flow of site traffic, the need for the first inhabitants to reach places of employment, education and retail sites adding considerably to the already poor air quality. The resultant traffic congestion adding to existing local residents woes.

As a Cobham resident I fail to see how our village can absorb the increased number of shoppers and their vehicles. And to Cobham people will come as it is unlikely that all necessary infrastructure will be up and running before the first residents move in. This is another cause for objecting to this element of the Local plan 2016. As for the calm assertion that these new residents will take either to their feet or bicycles; plainly these are developers with a well honed sense of humour bordering on the ridiculous.

Next we come to public transport or more sensibly the lack thereof. Even allowing for the longer trains that have been introduced by SWT there is not the capacity to absorb more passenger traffic from the local railway stations nor is there sufficient car parking space and / or provision thereof. Whilst being very grateful for the bus service we do have it is not going to be able to cope with the numbers of passengers at peak times. And even if additional services were introduced it will not make reliability any greater unless there is a dedicated bus lane from Esher via Cobham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4652  Respondent: 10957025 / Pauline Masters  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/7246  **Respondent:** 10958177 / Brian Cooke  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the impact on transport, local roads and road safety which will be considerable from such an estimated 4,000 extra cars. The railway stations, Cobham, Effingham and Horsley struggle to cope now with parking.

I object to the impact on air quality, which is poor now.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6660  **Respondent:** 10958753 / Ingrid Molossi  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17738  **Respondent:** 10958913 / Alan Batterbury  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Due to the increased number of cars the area would be subjected to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9010</th>
<th>Respondent: 10959009 / Rebecca Claridge</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6692</th>
<th>Respondent: 10959073 / Janine Light</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Reach is not able to sustain a volume of heavy vehicles, the road is too narrow to cope with heavy vehicles. We only have approximately 3 to 400 metres of pavement. Within the last six months a dog was killed by a fast driven car outside my house. Vehicles drive very fast along the road making it very difficult to safely walk. I have a two year old granddaughter, we are unable to walk along the road (no paths) due to the increase of vehicles using the road, the majority of cars drive as if they are on a race track.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18405</th>
<th>Respondent: 10959265 / Inger &amp; Ron Ward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/18492</th>
<th>Respondent: 10959265 / Inger &amp; Ron Ward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7789</th>
<th>Respondent: 10959457 / Maria Niblett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are to be built within the Green Belt land running along the A3. This will destroy the open enjoyment of the borough and produce even more accidents (currently at least one a week) on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already running at 200% capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7792</th>
<th>Respondent: 10959457 / Maria Niblett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the large proposed development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land (which now that we are exiting the European common market, will be needed for farmers to grow crop. The traffic generated from these houses will increase massively congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads like Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17754  Respondent: 10963233 / Susan Poole  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Allowing Green Belt development to pay for transport schemes will simply generate yet more traffic from more homes, fuelling congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11955  Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of consideration of poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12540  Respondent: 10968129 / Sheila Remnant  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As far as Burpham is concerned the tunnel and the access to Guildford (by-passing Burpham) MUST be dealt with before any building takes place. Burpham is not coping very well with the traffic at present. We knew Burpham when the London Road was the A3 and by the time the new A3 was built it was out of date anyway. Don't make the same mistake again. The A3 is like the M25 - the planners underestimated how much it would be used by local traffic (slipping on and off) these roads were not wide enough to contain the mass traffic - then the M25 could only be widened in certain places and the same applies to the A3.
Road systems should plan for the distant future as much as possible and the problems we have right now need to be resolved as soon as possible so that planning for housing and infrastructure can take place (not the other way round).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
- It is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable.
- Not everyone can cycle all the time.
- How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process - the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.
- Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle – and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?
- The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a “hoppa bus” can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.
- While I welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations (subject to negotiation with Network Rail) there could unintended consequences.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4993  Respondent: 10986689 / Richard Harris  Agent:

**Document**: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2410  Respondent: 10987137 / Susan Wong  Agent:

**Document**: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. Some changes to the roads are proposed but there will still be much more traffic in the Burpham area which already has serious problems. Will the new people enjoy living here when they discover it takes an extraordinary long time to get through Merrow and Burpham with all the clogged up roads? Some roads can be widened but it often causes a problem when the traffic is funneled in to narrower roads with less traffic lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)** The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8382</th>
<th>Respondent: 10989601 / Margaret Mew</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that &quot;Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.&quot; The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/2012</th>
<th>Respondent: 10989761 / James Walsh</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ID3, p130: Why I support measures to improve and enhance Guildford’s environment, and manage transport and parking across the borough, I do not believe that car-free parking is feasible or realistic – even in the town centre. While public transport remains expensive, crowded and unreliable, people will always own cars to travel to the town centre – or away from it. I believe that any developments that are built with “car-free” in mind will only increase parking problems for neighbouring streets – already a big problem across the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8312</th>
<th>Respondent: 10990145 / Anne Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re: Responses to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems conspiring to make the A247 even more dangerous and frequently impossible to navigate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposed green belt developments eg: at Gosden Hill and Wisley Airfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proposed development at Garlicks Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proposed new junctions off the A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clandon Park (National Trust) redevelopment as a major tourist attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Many blind spots for householders trying to exit on to the road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Increasing development of Clandon First School on the A247
7. The narrow sections on the road so that two lorries or buses cannot pass each other
8. Any accidents or problems on the A3 and/or M25 causing lengthy tail backs along the A247
9. Proposed tourist/play developments at Newlands Corner

10 Existing footpaths alongside the road non-existent and/or inadequate

The existing problems and proposed developments will completely overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. The A247 is already very heavily used whilst being entirely unsuitable for designation as an A road.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 October 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25 J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
- 12 July 2016 Two cars in collision (and at least one written off) outside Summers on the A247

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high. There is already 95% of a Clandon By Pass built: a consistently wide road with little housing fronting on to it. Park Lane and Merrow Lane lead directly from Merrow to the A3 at Burpham. Completing this by pass needs actioning before any further development in the Clandon area is considered and it is negligent of the Council not to pursue this in concert with Surrey County Council and the Highways Agency.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8333  Respondent: 10990145 / Anne Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14634  Respondent: 10992225 / Emma Ringshaw  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states: “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7414  Respondent: 10992833 / Amanda Verny White  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15723  Respondent: 10995585 / Patricia Swain  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Traffic - the Boroughs roads are already gridlocked. Increasing the population and therefore putting more cars on the road will just make things worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12489</th>
<th>Respondent: 10996737 / Sara Donnelly</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major transport issues are unresolved, the town is already congested.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7043</th>
<th>Respondent: 10997121 / Rob Curling</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11188</th>
<th>Respondent: 10998081 / David Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.
6] I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10446</th>
<th>Respondent: 11007425 / Kate McIver</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3971</th>
<th>Respondent: 11008225 / Russell Pascoe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to the increased number of cars the area will be subjected to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3087</th>
<th>Respondent: 11010273 / Dave Brownjohn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Transport

- It is unreasonable to seek approval of a local Plan without clarity on the essential issue of transport and roads infrastructure. The Plan indicates that road improvements will happen, but as some sort of evolving feast as directed by SCC and Highways England. This essential ingredient must be clearly defined for a Plan to be considered properly.
- In particular, the Gosden Hill development and its interaction with the A3 is too vague and not realistic. The suggestion of on & off slips to the A3 southbound only is ridiculous, and the alternative proposal by Highways England of a possible multi-direction interchange cannot be left to their discretion and to whether or not some funds can be found (because of course they will not). An integrated A3 multi-direction interchange plan must be part of the developers plan.
- The existing Clay Lane northbound access is just not sufficient, bearing in mind the extra traffic that will be generated by the various proposed housing and commercial developments to the north of the town, as well as Slyfield and Gosden Hill. It should also have some consideration of whether access/egress to Gosden Hill could be via the proposed improved interchange at Burgh Common, avoiding the otherwise inevitable increased congestion in Burpham.
- The potential traffic solution of a tunnel must also be integrated with the Burpham development plan, as the Burgh Common to A320 section of the A3 must be the likely start point for such a development.

There are frequent references to the Sustainable Movement Corridor, but no definitive route is proposed. There is 1 small part shown in Appendix C, but no indication of how this will be achieved from Gosden Hill/Burpham to the Town Centre. For instance, presumably Park & Ride buses will just follow the existing London Road into Guildford, adding to the existing congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7578  Respondent: 11010401 / J M Bates  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6894  Respondent: 11011969 / Diana Gibson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Furthermore these two villages are typical of the beautiful and picturesque countryside of Surrey where many roads are narrow, with little or no pavement. Walking along these is already unsafe, with cars and lorries dangerously close to pedestrians, whether these are families with young children or elderly people using walking aids. The increase in traffic caused by building on the site near Horsley station at one end of the village and on the site of Thatchers Hotel at the other end will greatly exacerbate this danger.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/12480  Respondent: 11013153 / Peter Carter  Agent:**

**Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3**

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure.

1. Roads – The overall road network within Guildford is already hugely challenged. In particular the A3, which will be a major feeder road for the expansion in the West of Guildford will be unable to cope at peak periods. Guildford already can’t cope when there is a problem on the A3, adding thousands of additional cars to this route will make it materially worse. It is also likely that the A31 will also be overburdened. The evidence for this over-burden is clear. Already in the period since the prior town plan there have been a number of fatalities and serious injuries caused by traffic volumes in the town centre. Increasing road usage will exacerbate this situation. Finally, the road network that the Blackwell Farm Site will be dependent on also feeds the hospital, a part of the road network just off the A3 and suffering from existing capacity problems at peak periods. This is also the same network that feeds the hospital. At peak periods the additional traffic will literally put people’s lives at risk. Even excepting this the evidence provided by the plan suggests that in the evening rush hour (with all the change being considered) traffic volumes will actually slow.

2. Rail – Guildford is hugely dependent upon the rail network, in particular for travel to / from London. Even at weekends the current rail provision is such that it can be difficult to get a seat. On weekdays, particularly between 7 and 9 am and between 5 and 8pm it can literally be impossible to get a seat. While further increases in capacity and frequency are to be welcomed, the reality of these changes is that they are required now with the current volume of passengers – I travel regularly on these trains and passengers fainting as a consequence of the conditions is a relatively frequent occurrence. Adding thousands of new homes, and at least hundreds of new commuters without the development of a substantially new rail network – including new terminus or significant expansion at Waterloo (one of the major constraints to rail volume) will leave Guildford woefully under-served by its rail connections. It is also apparent that some proposals exist to increase population along the train route between Portsmouth and London – it is not clear that the impact of all of these changes at the same time have been considered on the capacity changes.

3. Town centre access – As discussed the current draft local plan, with its anticipated reduction in car-parking and traffic volumes is completely incompatible with the proposals in the local plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/2466  Respondent: 11014881 / Linda Peters-Smith  Agent:**

**Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3**

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy 13 - Sustainable Transport For New Developments

I object.

The policy is inspirational, unrealistic and have not been thought through.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17728  Respondent: 11023489 / Trevor Pound  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the inevitable congestion on local roads as a result of this housing strategy.

Anybody who lives around Guildford would vouch for the fact that the A3 comes to a standstill several times a week, particularly around the Guildford area. To put it simply, this proposed housing strategy will cause absolutely chaos on the roads, and it is not only an ill-advised strategy as a result, but to ignore this fact would show the Local Council to be extremely naive to the problems we face in the South East.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2052  Respondent: 11023585 / Jean Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12.1 OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11678  Respondent: 11024257 / Jenny Richardson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6733  Respondent: 11024769 / Sarah Runton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This fundamentally contradicts the plan’s assertion that the development will encourage more cyclists and pedestrians. One heavy rainfall is all it takes to cause drainage to overflow and local roads to flood. These roads were built for minimum traffic and most don’t have pavements, are badly lit and there is certainly no room for expansion to include any purpose built cycle lanes or designated cycle routes.

The A3 and the M25 are hugely congested at rush hour in the very area the plan proposes to build this substantial number of dwellings. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

The problem is further exacerbated by the lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

I trust that these objections will be fully considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16812  Respondent: 11024769 / Sarah Runton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking without substantial investment in cycle lanes and pathways as well as pavements. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional vehicles. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV traffic.
3. This fundamentally contradicts the plan’s assertion that the development will encourage more cyclists and pedestrians. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians is obvious to all who live in the area, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
4. The increase in the already
severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25.

Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6878  Respondent: 11028385 / Philippa Lawrence  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The traffic situation in Send is already ridiculously high and as a result I object to the proposal for a new interchange with the A3 at burnt common. The village simply cannot handle an increased level of traffic which such proposal would bring. The whole village would become gridlocked and impossible for those families living here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2146  Respondent: 11028737 / Sue Kershaw  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3854  Respondent: 11032129 / Claire Sinclair  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The proposal not to grant Effingham junction PTI status is baffling since the very arguments used to further Horsley stations claim are used against Effingham Junction. EJ plans just as an important role and is far more accessible than Horsley and should have PTI status.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16240  Respondent: 11033057 / Jo Komisarczuk  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy E2 at Garlicks Arch (A43) 7,000 sq. m of warehousing and storage use Class B1c, B2 and B8) floor space will be directed to the Industrial Strategic Employment Sites. This could be put either at Slyfield or just to the South in Burnt Common where there is an existing brown field site which can easily accommodate the requirement, and was removed from the plan with less than two weeks notice. How can it be beneficial to take land out of production and lose ancient woodland and leave an existing brownfield site giving no benefit.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16243  Respondent: 11033057 / Jo Komisarczuk  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that Guildford Borough Council members stood for the green belt and people voted them back in, now their true colours are shown, and they want to insert so much Green belt, while not giving consideration for brown field sites and population density in existing urban areas. Even The MP for Mole Valley says that this plan is not fit for purpose.

I Object to the huge impact on the local Trunk Roads A3 and M25, huge improvements need to be made to these routes prior to any housing being added to the area. The A3 to Guildford is a large car park at peak hours. The expected time for improvements to the A3 Guildford is 2020 at the very earliest and now we have Brexit to add to the thoughts of this plan, there is no way that the timetable for such infrastructures’ to be updated prior to this date. Therefore this is another reason the plan should not stand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11651  Respondent: 11033185 / Sarah Lee  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the congestion that development will cause and the lack of road infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Pollution:

The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough. I object to higher levels of pollution in our villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object - Has the person who wrote this policy visited the villages which are supposed to be subject to it. This is a generic list of town centre initiative which people aspire to, not a realistic set of principles for a village environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The transport infrastructure in Guildford is already stretched to its limits at peak times - the A3 and A31 in the area of Onslow Village, the hospital and the cathedral, in particular. The road network is simply at or beyond capacity and adding further traffic to the area would cause misery for commuters, local residents and emergency services alike. I actually find it incredible that anyone could have proposed the scale of development they have for the west of Guildford in light of its impact on the road network as must surely have been highlighted by any traffic assessments.
Locally to us, the infant school in Onslow Village is already subject to considerable road noise and pollution, which would worsen if the A3 was widened, which surely it would have to be to cope with any future expansion, let alone the amount proposed. Only a major project such as the A3 Guildford bypass tunnel project would be likely to have a significant impact. Additionally, the proposed junction for the Blackwell Farm development at the top of the Farnham Road is likely to make the roads busier and more dangerous in Onslow Village as vehicles seek to find alternative, clearer routes, magnifying the current issues that occur whenever there are problems on the A3 or A31.

Train transport is similarly at its limits in Guildford with commuter trains between Guildford and London some of the most overcrowded in the country – my husband is forced to stand or sit on the floor during his daily commute despite several trains an hour and an expensive season ticket. Any increase in capacity as a result of electrification of tracks or increased numbers of trains is needed just to deal with current problems. I am baffled as to how adding extra stations at ‘East’ and ‘West’ Guildford is supposed to help as surely the majority of those commuters would just be using the trains from there as a shuttle to the mainline station?

I do not believe that the proposed mitigating interventions do more than tinker at the edges, even if they were only to tackle the current issues, and are woefully inadequate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
flood badly and have no footpaths. The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK. The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times. Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town. I like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services. The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented. Ie. Cost of housing will increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1009   Respondent: 11036321 / Vinciane Ollington   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Sites being planned in unsustainable locations

Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3739   Respondent: 11036705 / Brian Slade   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT that the already overloaded infrastructure and existing transport overload seems to have been completely ignored in the case of Send as has the existing traffic congestion during peak times in Send and in particular the A247 being used by large commercial vehicles for which the road is totally unsuited. This is without the inevitable significant overload which will be caused by the proposed additional housing population and industrial development which is just not sustainable and will cause major inconvenience and significantly increased polution for the existing population of Send. Additional housing is already being developed in Tannery Lane as well as the Marina being developed using a narrow road with a dangerous junction onto the A247 in the middle of Send Village. Send is already becoming the through route from Woking to the M25 and A3 and will become gridlocked all day - even without the proposed NEW 4-Way A3 Interchange This alone will destroy the village and cause major Health and Safety problems,
particularly in relation to the major school development and merger of two schools which fronts onto Send Barns Lane (A247) where parents already cause serious parking congestion and traffic problems with just the one current school without the addition of the new second one.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16177  **Respondent:** 11036737 / Charley Penny  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

- The large developments planned for this area, Garlick’s arch (A43), Wisley Airfield (A35) and Gosden Farm (A25) will put a significant amount of pressure on the local amenities. The transport links are not built for this level of development and with the lack of a railway station and poor bus links it means that a lot of people will have a car. The roads around these areas are small and are already gridlocked at peak times. With these three developments, as well as some of the smaller infilling of houses (including over 500 houses built in the Horsley area), there will be even more gridlock during peak times then there already is.

- The smaller roads of Polesdon Lane, Papercourt Lane and Tannery Lane will simply not be able to cope with the increased amount of traffic. This will put further strain on Ripley High Street, Newark Lane and Send Road which are always very busy.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16465  **Respondent:** 11037217 / Bo Johnson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

**Policy i3 Sustainable Transport for new developments - OBJECT:**

- The plan states that no provision is being made for improving transport (road, rail, bus etc) in the borough and that the onus will be on developers to propose and secure travel plans for their developments and contribute to transport arrangements. This is totally unrealistic where development and major housebuilding companies are involved and we are going to be left with roads and transport links that cannot cope with the level of use (they are already failing us).

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1880  **Respondent:** 11037441 / Bryan Joseph  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( No ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )
No mention of cycle storage in the document. Secure storage other than at stations would encourage the use of cycles within the communities concerned.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15398  Respondent: 11039041 / Robert Foreman  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The roads in the Horsleys are narrow, many without pavements, and not suitable for increased traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1961  Respondent: 11039681 / Bruce Jeffrenson  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15977  Respondent: 11040481 / D G Spratt  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/9441  Respondent: 11041153 / Melissa Ransome  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development to this site A43 Garlicks Arch. The National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. Bus services are reduced in the area and there is no train station within reasonable walking distance. It is non-viable for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is completely inappropriate (Policy I3).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9445  Respondent: 11041153 / Melissa Ransome  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). The following statement is contained within the Plan: "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The immense level of development being proposed, in particular to the north east of the borough, will lead to a considerable increase in congestion. This will be particularly severe in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on the health of local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1907  Respondent: 11041281 / Chris Harlow  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11561  Respondent: 11042433 / Sam Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14604  **Respondent:** 11044129 / Christopher Barrass  **Agent:**

| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6754  **Respondent:** 11045601 / Chloe Hartwell  **Agent:**

| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

Transport

It should be a prerequisite that Southwest Trains provide more trains to/from Horsley into Central London if these developments go ahead.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8768  **Respondent:** 11046593 / ANGELA GUNNING  **Agent:**

| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
We are calling on the Council to put forward a travelling and commuting scheme that encourages and promotes the use of public transport over car usage. We are calling for the areas to be pedestrianised and for more cycling lanes.

We support the Council’s plans to redevelop the bus station and make it a station our residents can be proud of.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Elimination of much of (2) (d) about parking and its replacement by new (4) welcomed.

Key paragraphs 4.6.28 and 4.6.30a noted.

This Policy is grossly deficient as regards provision of new or extended Park and Ride facilities, despite the signalling of need in 4.6.30a.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
there is no room for the provision of cycle lanes. New residents will have few options but to commute to work by car, leading to an unacceptable level of traffic on the roads through Ockham and the Horsleys. The draft Plan fails to recognise that the majority of the infrastructure in East and West Horsley is finite, is not capable of expansion and has no capacity to absorb a large increase in population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9605  Respondent: 11053889 / Claire Handley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT) as the policy which fails to address the real life constraints and demands of modern life. In failing to recognising employment opportunities (or lack of them) within the local communities, the Council’s proposals are unrealistic and fail to address the commuting pressures of the population who will occupy the proposed new housing developments, frequently located on the village fringes. The majority of people cannot or will not walk or cycle – commuters are in a hurry and many will already face a long commute to work. The elderly, children, people with disabilities or who are unwell or unfit, or simply people carrying heavy shopping will not walk or jump on a bike. Life in a village is very different to life in an urban area and the Council failed to address these differences. Roads in the Horsleys are narrow and in a poor condition making them hazardous for cyclists – pavements switch from side to side or disappear completely, are narrow, often overgrown and not suitable for hugely increased numbers of people (particularly families with buggies / young children).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12329  Respondent: 11054049 / Clare Goodall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16314  Respondent: 11058817 / Janet E Sims  Agent:
Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Local roads are already overwhelmed by rush hour traffic; in the north of the borough in particular the current traffic volumes on commuter routes which are often country lanes are creating long queues through village centres such as Ripley and Send, impacting on the quality of life including the exposure to harmful levels of vehicle emissions.
- Rail services into London where many of the new residents are likely to work are already at or above capacity. The fast services from Woking will be chosen by many commuters living in the new properties planned for Wisley site A35, Garlick’s Arch A43 and those to the east of the A3. This will cause further traffic issues through the villages en-route to Woking.
- Bus services are currently inadequate, slow, declining in number and due in part to the traffic issues above are totally unsuitable to be promoted as an alternative for commuters in the villages outside of Guildford.
- Active travel in the villages will in the main be cycling, this is not an attractive alternative due to the narrow country lanes which cyclists would need to travel on en-route to local stations. Currently cyclists on these commuter routes increase congestion as it is not possible for cars and commercial vehicles to safely overtake them; unless proper provision is created then this is not a sustainable alternative.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14250  Respondent: 11061185 / Peter Komisarczuk  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object due to poor air quality concerns and noise pollution levels (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

In addition to air quality the proposed previous development in the fields adjacent to Garlicks Arch noted that the levels of noise from the A3 were high and this would lead to poor quality of life for the new residents. We live on the opposite side of Burnt Common Close – so further from the A3 – and we certainly find the traffic noise can be tiresome, especially in winter when there is less deadening of the noise and the wind direction can carry noise from the A3. Adding the on/off ramp will make air quality poorer and add more noise because there will be more traffic on all roads around this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17420  Respondent: 11063233 / David Ebdon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Have you seen the traffic congestion on the M25 near the A3? Have you seen how difficult it is to join the M25 from the A3 in the mornings? Have you seen the congestion leaving the M25 for those who work in our area? Yet…………… you are proposing more housing and encouraging more jobs for people outside our area without a thought of improving the infrastructure………which after all should be considered well ahead of any future development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8845  Respondent: 11071553 / Nicholas Roberts  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT) – I object to this pious and overoptimistic list of measures. They are just not rooted in the realities of living in Guildford. Sustainability should set a limit on development – not (as here) assume that it can be magicked up to support excessive housebuilding.

The assumptions about walking and cycling are totally unrealistic. These modes of travel will not be used by most of Guildford’s population. Many are increasingly pressed for time, old, frail and obese. Others are too young, unwell or carrying heavy loads.

Not enough attention is given to transport in the countryside, where there is little public transport and no chance of funding its expansion. It disregards the poor state of our roads (the worst county in the country) and the additional problems that will be caused by excessive housebuilding in the countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12393  Respondent: 11074465 / Louise Vaughan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the proposed developments at Flexford, Normandy and Keens Lane, Worplesdon.

In both cases these developments will place even greater strain on traffic movements on the A 323, which is already seriously overloaded at peak times. In addition the private application to develop the Roker golf course at Fairlands with a secondary school and 370 houses (16/P/01397) cannot be ignored in the context of the Local Plan. If approved, this development would discharge its traffic directly onto the A323, with wholly undesirable consequences.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments This is another aspirational policy, not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport. The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow...
anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many
flood badly and have no footpaths. The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and
train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in
the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at
huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which
delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK. The vast majority of
the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look
smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling
discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially
unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for
even part of their journey if it means longer travel times. Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are
too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in
town. I like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit
of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.
The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at
any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or
presented. Ie. Cost of housing will increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15865  Respondent: 11098369 / Neil & Nicki Covington  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

WE OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental
impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the
north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution,
which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2668  Respondent: 11113249 / Holy Trinity Amenity Group (HTAG) (Bob Bromham)
Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

P129 (4) In terms of vehicular parking for new developments:

(a) in Controlled Parking Zones, or component areas thereof, in which the demand for on-street parking by residents of
existing dwellings and, where allowed, `pay and display’ visitor parking exceeds the supply of designated on-street
parking spaces, planning permission for new residential development resulting in a net increase in dwellings will be
subject to a planning obligation to require that future occupants will not be eligible for on-street residents parking
permits, with the exception of disabled people who will be eligible. We welcome this action to restrict residents parking permits. However we ask that no permits are issued in established residential areas for new dwellings, irrespective of the perceived demand; experience has shown that in most areas the demand is already too much.

**P129.** “(6) The provision and/or improvement of a car club by a new development will be supported if appropriate.”

Car clubs clearly support reduced car use, by their “pay as you go” system. We ask that the qualification “if appropriate” be deleted.

**P130.** “(11) The provision of additional public off-street car parking in Guildford town centre will be supported when it facilitates the interception of trips that would otherwise drive through the Guildford gyratory.”

We ask that this be reworded: that would otherwise drive through the town centre or surrounding residential areas. “Rat runs” are increasingly a problem along narrow residential roads, and create safety risks; problems are not limited to the gyratory.

**P133.** “Monitoring Indicators...Walking, cycling, bus and rail modal share for travel to work journey of Guildford borough residents”.

It is known that a significant proportion of the congestion traffic is caused by children being taken to schools around the centre, and that some are from outside Guildford. We suggest reword as “…for travel to work and school.”

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6823  **Respondent:** 11114721 / Elizabeth Wilcockson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object that housing on the Green Belt will increase traffic bringing increased danger and pollution and slower journey times on our already overcrowded village roads.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6839  **Respondent:** 11114721 / Elizabeth Wilcockson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

12. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14039</th>
<th>Respondent: 11136993 / Elliot Machin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An addition of said developments would add to this already major problem. The Portsmouth Road, Send Road and Send Marsh Road are already overloaded. With further large developments, these roads would be gridlocked. Noise and pollution levels are already at excessive levels!</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17414</th>
<th>Respondent: 11149217 / Royal Horticultural Society (RHS)</th>
<th>Agent: Montagu Evans LLP (Montagu Evans)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As stated previously, RHS Wisley is the most popular tourist / cultural attraction in the Borough, and is one of the world’s most significant gardens. The Garden is one of the top attractions in England and has approximately 1 million visitors per year with the anticipation of visitor numbers increasing to 1.4 million visitors by 2023. Enhancing and maintaining the quality of the visitor experience and providing the necessary facilities for these numbers is of the utmost importance to the Society. As part of the recent planning application submissions, forms of sustainable transport were reviewed alongside the exploration of promoting more sustainable forms of transport and how existing parking facilities can be used more efficiently. Through this process and the ongoing masterplan exercise, all reasonable endeavours will be undertaken to explore sustainable transport methods that can be implemented to mitigate against the potential impacts of increasing visitor numbers. These measures need to be appropriate to the needs and demographic of the majority of visitors to RHS Wisley. It is noted that the number of visitors to Wisley changes through the week and season, but largely fall outside of peak hours where highway network congestion is at its greatest. Due to the current physical constraints of the site and its rural location, including narrow roads to the north and west and the A3 and M25 to the east and south, providing safe alternative transport methods is challenging. Planned improvements to the M25 Junction 10 would be welcomed. With that said, the RHS support the aims of Policy 13 and are encouraged that the policy wording incorporates ‘where appropriate’. This acknowledges the difficulties new developments face within rural areas of the Borough.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enhancing and maintaining the quality of the visitor experience and providing the necessary facilities for the increased number of visitors is of the utmost importance to the RHS. As part of the recent planning consents forms of sustainable transport were reviewed alongside the exploration of promoting more sustainable forms of transport and how existing parking facilities can be used more efficiently.

Through this process and the ongoing masterplan exercise, all reasonable endeavours will be undertaken to explore sustainable transport methods that can be implemented to mitigate against the potential impacts of increasing visitor numbers. These measures need to be appropriate to the needs and demographic of the majority of visitors to RHS Wisley. It is noted that the number of visitors to Wisley changes through the week and season, but largely fall outside of peak hours where highway network congestion is at its greatest.

Due to the current physical constraints of the site and its rural location, including narrow roads to the north and west and the A3 and M25 to the east and south, providing safe alternative transport methods is challenging.

The planned improvements to the M25 Junction 10 are welcomed subject to their detailed design, which is currently being discussed by the RHS with Highways England, with ‘improved access to Wisley Garden’ being a specific aim of the highways improvement. The RHS is opposed to any landtake from their RPG site, and seeks an appropriate local road network to support its operations, as well as a Junction 10 solution.

Policy ID3 has been amended to include requirements for new developments to meet including maximising the use of walking, cycling and public and community transport. This policy now requires developments to meet criteria outlined rather than expect and incorporate sustainable transport modes where appropriate, which is how the policy was previously worded.

Whilst the RHS support the aims of Policy ID3 and seeks to encourage, where possible, sustainable transport modes, it is important that flexibility is applied to new developments within rural areas of the borough where there is reliance on vehicular use.

With that said, we request that the policy wording incorporates ‘where appropriate’ with regards to rural areas of the borough as previously included.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Adequate infrastructure is not in place to accommodate these developments and no provision has been allowed for such – particularly roads and waste. The local roads cannot handle the current traffic numbers – without significant investment in alternative road systems the local area will become completely clogged with traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I support a tunnel from Send to Compton that takes the through traffic on the A3 away from our local roads. I also support a four way junction at Send or Potters Lane with a direct route through to Merrow. I also support a four way junction at the A3/A320 in Guildford so that A3 traffic have direct and improved route through to Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16311  Respondent: 11182849 / Ian Featherstone  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Local roads are already overwhelmed by rush hour traffic; in the north of the borough in particular the current traffic volumes on commuter routes which are often country lanes are creating long queues through village centres such as Ripley and Send, impacting on the quality of life including the exposure to harmful levels of vehicle emissions.
- Rail services into London where many of the new residents are likely to work are already at or above capacity. The fast services from Woking will be chosen by many commuters living in the new properties planned for Wisley site A35, Garlick’s Arch A43 and those to the east of the A3. This will cause further traffic issues through the villages en-route to Woking.
- Bus services are currently inadequate, slow, declining in number and due in part to the traffic issues above are totally unsuitable to be promoted as an alternative for commuters in the villages outside of Guildford.
- Active travel in the villages will in the main be cycling, this is not an attractive alternative due to the narrow country lanes which cyclists would need to travel on en-route to local stations. Currently cyclists on these commuter routes increase congestion as it is not possible for cars and commercial vehicles to safely overtake them; unless proper provision is created then this is not a sustainable alternative.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7300  Respondent: 11547041 / Jen Wright  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Secondly, the area is not well equipped infrastructure wise to deal with the increased traffic and people that increased housing would lead to. Clay Lane, Jacobs Well Road and Blanchards Hill are already extremely busy roads. Blanchards Hill has no footpath and is 40mph making it dangerous for there to be further traffic and pedestrians. Although if it is removed from the green belt then I would expect the road safety to be investigated and a 30mph limit put in place along the road as per most residential non green belt roads.
Clay Lane link road

I object to the building of the clay lane link road from Slyfield to Clay Lane. I have previously provided detailed reasons why I object to this but briefly, Clay lane, Blanchards Hill and other local roads are already very busy and dangerous, particularly at rush hour. Blanchards Hill is a rural road with no footpath and would be particularly more dangerous if traffic was to increase. A lot of the houses along all roads are very close to the road and therefore resulting increase in heavy traffic would be detrimental to the buildings as well as causing disruption to the inhabitants. It would also ruin the nature of the area by making it a busy thoroughfare rather than a village where people live.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/265  Respondent: 11967329 / Anthony Sandifer Mallard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Borough Planners have consistently ignored the views of experts and local people in respect of developments in Burpham. Local flooding has been the consequence of a lack of improved infrastructure when considering planning applications. Congestion and pollution has been exacerbated by poor planning decisions in respect of infill, housing and commercial development and the growth of a local secondary school with its greatly increased catchment area, necessitating the use of busses and domestic vehicles to convey pupils to and from the premises, combined with HGVs servicing the two superstores, has seen pollution levels climb exponentially. This increases demand on an already overburdened primary and secondary health care service.

The apparently planned 'improvements' to access to and from the A3 not only does not improve the situation of congestion and pollution but increases it, to the detriment of the residents and road users. Witness the now frequent congestion on the A3 around the Cathedral area, this backs up the southbound A3 carriageway and road users divert at the 'Merrow and Burpham Interchange' in the mistaken belief that this will improve their journey time. The reality is that the traffic is stationary or very slow moving through Burpham- and thus pollution is increased. To add to this by requiring any new and additional traffic to travel, from proposed developments, to the Northbound A3 [or Slyfield] via Burpham is frankly mindblowingly stupid. All the evidence points to a conclusion that it will increase the deadly effects of pollution and bring gridlock to the local roads.

The 'Improved' two way junction will do nothing to 'improve' the situation on the A3 and A3100. Any plans to extend 'potential' to 'reality' in respect of the B2234 will further increase the level of traffic and pollution. The proposed 'Sustainable Movement Corridor' along the A3100 is clearly an idea that appears 'good' on paper and has been drawn up by someone somewhat distant from the reality of the situation. Vehicles are becoming physically larger, traffic, as illustrated, is becoming heavier and Burpham's local roads are more and more frequently being used by HGVs, particularly, as mentioned, in the servicing of the two Burpham superstores, the road identified is not wide enough to allow two additional lanes for public transport. Is land and property to be compulsory purchased to fulfil this aspect of the plan? I would, however, agree, that in the event of realistically costed plan to build Guildford Tunnel on this part of the A3 - similar to the Hindhead one - then land does NOW need to be identified by way of forward planning. The Local Plan should, in my opinion, also encompass relevant aspects of the Highway Agency's Plans for this major route as it significantly impacts of the community at Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14548  Respondent: 11967745 / Terence Vincent  Agent:
I live off of Clay Lane in Burpham and pass over the A3 daily and witness the stationery traffic south bound towards Guildford twice a day. This traffic has dramatically increased over a relatively short period of time. The issue of the A3 needs to be overcome before thousands of new houses are built. The suggested tunnel under Guildford needs to be thoroughly investigated before houses are built in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17090  Respondent: 11967777 / Christine Vincent  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

TRAFFIC:

I live off of Clay Lane in Burpham and pass over the A3 daily and witness the stationery traffic south bound towards Guildford twice a day. This traffic has dramatically increased over a relatively short period of time. The issue of the A3 needs to be overcome before thousands of new houses are built. The suggested tunnel under Guildford needs to be thoroughly investigated before houses are built in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16663  Respondent: 12050145 / richard gunston  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The plan means considerable increase in pollution which is already high in Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18643  Respondent: 12136289 / Martin Digby  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Transport evidence is not yet fit for use and major transport issues are unresolved eg another river crossing, a central bus facility.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11148</th>
<th>Respondent: 14188833 / Graham Mills</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transport:

The evidence on future traffic conditions which has been provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report was produced late and is incomplete. Critical information on congestion has not been given in time to be taken into account in the plan proposals.

The proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor is simple unsound and cannot be delivered due to the narrow roads and pinch points on an already very congested route through Burpham.

Of further note is that the proposed Gosden Hill development of 2000 houses plus offices, school etc will add significant pressure to the already congested London road and New Inn Lane. The increase in solution and noise is unacceptable.

The phasing of the proposed Gosden Hill development is in advance of proposed improvements to the A3. This makes no sense.

The major transport issues around Guildford need to be resolved before any further development is considered, these include the proposed A3 tunnel, new river crossing, a workable central bus terminal and a rail station at Merrow.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7982</th>
<th>Respondent: 15062145 / Philippa Hackett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems that Guildford Borough Council is planning a series of large developments along the A3 corridor but has not thoroughly looked at the impact of this for the surrounding villages. The villages on both sides of the A3 have very inadequate roads to cope with the anticipated amount of traffic and the roads available cannot be improved to the point that will ease the expected congestion. There are many other worries as well, such as environmental concerns, noise pollution, air pollution levels, flood risks, the sheer quantity of housing and industrial units supposedly required, the list goes on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4190</th>
<th>Respondent: 15076513 / Ian Groden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the fact that land will be removed from the Green Belt before detailed traffic assessments and confirmed road improvement approvals are in place to prove development is possible. Adequate infrastructure provision should be a precondition of sustainable development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

34 POLICY I3 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

34.1 I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments

34.2 This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

34.3 The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

34.4 The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

34.5 The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day, as I used to do. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

34.6 Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

34.7 Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.
34.8 The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8952  Respondent: 15107297 / Ian McQuattie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):

- Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
- Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
- Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. I.e. most residents!
- Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/137  Respondent: 15107777 / Paul Ayers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I should also like to object about the disproportionate concentration of proposed new development areas in this part of the Borough ie Ripley/Send/Wisley. The infrastructure is clearly not able to support more population and the improvement of the A3 junction at Burnt Common would be grossly insufficient to improve even the current situation let alone an increased level of population and traffic movement.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4517  Respondent: 15127777 / Keith Hammond  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Effingham Common Road

My daughter goes to Howard of Effingham School by bus. Occasionally, some mornings, I may have to take her in. Effingham Common Road from the school to Effingham Junction, in direction of Wisley, is usually a solid traffic jam for its whole length (over 1 mile) at this time in the morning, although it does move steadily.

As I turn off onto Forest Road (when coming home) I do not know what the road is like once it becomes Old Lane, but presumably the traffic is still very heavy. These are country lanes. Clearly building a village/town of 2000 plus houses between this traffic jam and the A3 will have an enormous impact.

When I raised this issue, specifically with a GBC officer specialising on transport, at the East Horsley open day, he confirmed that they were completely unaware of this issue!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/366  Respondent: 15136097 / Peter Fava  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposed building at Wisley Airfield and Gosden Hill Farm will also add enormously to the flow of traffic through this area, an area that already experiences near grid-lock each rush hour. The A3 between Guildford and Burnt Common must suffer from the greatest number of fatalities of any road in Surrey. The new access/exit to the A3 at Burnt Common will increase capacity onto minor country roads doing little to improve the flow of traffic. The additional junctions will also make the A3 even more dangerous on this terrible stretch of road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9174  Respondent: 15136641 / Jason Dack  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10922  Respondent: 15138273 / David Latin  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Traffic and parking: Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley & Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected.

Local Road Network: In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well.

Pollution: The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9754  Respondent: 15140225 / Stephen Reed  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

re the GBC plan to build over 14,000 new homes under the revised draft local plan such as Garlicks' Arch, Wisley and Gosden Hill.

It is bad enough getting out of Send Marsh Road onto Portsmouth Road in rush hour times and this area CANNOT cope with additional housing and traffic. Soon there will be a fatal collision as the roads cannot cope with this extra traffic.

The extra road traffic will also affect the M25 around junction 10 and the A3 south bound to Guildford. Both of which can be very congested. It's not just the amount of vehicles, but the extra noise and air pollution they will emit.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10871  Respondent: 15140705 / Simon Moxon  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The local road network is already over capacity and the increase in traffic will gridlock Ripley village and surrounding areas especially during rush hours. Simply put, our roads were not designed for the amount of traffic now on our roads let alone what your plan proposes.
I suffer with a respiratory disorder made worse by heavy traffic pollution, your proposed plan and the increase in traffic will severely affect my breathing.

Ripley already has a massive shortage of parking for vehicles, the proposed plan will make the situation far worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/496  Respondent:  15142977 / Paulina Adair  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The plans you are proposing would have devastating consequences for the local traffic. The stretch of A3 from M25 past Guildford is extremely busy both ways not only in the rush hours anymore. The traffic congestion starts well before 8am and continue pretty much all day. Suggesting that this stretch of A3 can take any more traffic resulting from building over 6500 houses is frankly insane.

Please have consideration for the local traffic connecting to A3 and the residents of the area using the local roads. We will end up in a situation where we cannot pull out of our drives to join the traffic on the main road through Send because it will be just solid queues both ways.

And adding another junction to A3 at Garlick's Arch is going to make traffic worse for both local roads and A3. I strongly object against adding another junction to A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10863  Respondent:  15143681 / Mark Clover  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I work as a Driving Instructor and use the roads daily. In the last five years my job has become increasingly difficult, just trying to get between pupils and to teach them safely. On average the A246 which runs through our village is completely blocked both morning and night at least twice a week. This can be due to a road repair in old Woking, a broken down lorry or more regularly now, a crash on either the A3 or M25 leading to vehicles exiting these roads in favour of the local roads.

The A247 has houses both sides for most of it with limited parking, so cars are parked on the road, reducing it to single lane status in many places. The junction with Broadmead roundabout leads in to small roads, already carrying far more cars than they were ever designed to do. This road also has dense terrace housing with no parking other than on the road. Have you ever tried driving down this road in the evening or when the A3 is blocked? It is simply gridlocked. The air pollution from the stationary cars and lorries is awful!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/522  Respondent: 15143873 / S.M Dedman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to the Garlicks Arch planned development.

My concern is the impact of such a large development would have on the community, which is already well stretched.

The A3 link roads entry and exit at Burnt Common won't ease the problem through Ripley village as the flow on A3 is often at a crawl at Rush hour therefore cars now come of the A3 slip road to Burnt Common and Send and then rejoin the cue at Wisley for the M25, likewise people who live in Send etc will still join the A3 through Ripley because they know there is often a problem in the morning rush hour when traffic gets built up from the M25 back towards Burpham, and quite often its a build up on the South Bound carriageway especially in late afternoon tailing back from Guildford.

So the development at Garlick Arch will only bring more congestion on our roads, and extra pressure on schools medical centre etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/528  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the large number of houses proposed in the plan on all of the sites. The increased population will undoubtedly place extra traffic onto roads which already struggle to cope with the current population. The A247 through Send is a small road in a bad state of repair due to traffic loading. During certain periods of the day the traffic queues back for more than a mile and as soon as any maintenance or service works are undertaken the road becomes realistically impassable during peak periods. The village of Old Woking provides a bottle neck for traffic heading toward Woking and Maybury and increasing population in Send and beyond will only exacerbate the situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/549  Respondent: 15144545 / Stacey Maxwell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Implications on traffic

Building as many houses as proposed will have a catastrophic effect on the A3 and local roads. The road I live on is already ridiculously busy and due to the bottleneck at the end of the road, I see a lot of aggressive driving. How will these roads cope with any more traffic? Will building more houses help with the aggressiveness? I think not. For example, the site at Wisley Airfield proposed over 2,000 houses which could mean (at the very least) an extra 4,000 cars on the road. Given Highways England has no plans to improve the A3 in the
immediate future, how on earth will the surrounding villages be able to cope? For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

1. **Congestion on the local village roads**
   Following on from #4, the villages are already at capacity from the sheer amount of traffic we currently experience. The parking situation on the high street and surrounding roads is not sustainable. The house that I share with my partner has neither a driveway nor allocated space so we are reliant on being able to park on the road outside our house. More traffic on our roads from these proposed developments leading to a larger population would be disastrous. I STRONGLY OBJECT to further development which will do nothing to help with the current congestion or parking issues we currently face.

1. **Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic**
   The surrounding villages around these strategic sites by their very definition have a lot of country lanes which are very narrow and often allow for only 1 car to pass at a time. On the road I live, I often see heavy goods vehicles and other unsuitable vehicles, such as coaches, pass by which are totally unsuitable for this road. The local roads are not in an optimal condition either which would only get worse with more traffic. For these reasons, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9171  **Respondent:** 15144545 / Stacey Maxwell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/558  **Respondent:** 15144641 / Andy Doughty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

We already see significant traffic through Ripley, Send and Clandon. During the development stage this would increase significantly and remain at much higher levels than currently experienced once completed. The proposal of Garlick’s Arch in particular would create huge increases in additional congestion.

I do not feel the development meets any needs of the local communities and only see any development of these areas as a negative move and therefore object to the proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/586  Respondent: 15145249 / Colin Wells  Agent:  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

I am very concerned about the proposed changes to the A3 Junction at Burnt common. I travel along those roads on a daily basis and the proposed changes to this junction or the provision of a new large junction will simply overload the already busy roads and local services. I am concerned that these changes will lead to traffic cutting through Send and Old Woking to reach Woking centre. I object to the proposed new A3 Junction layout for those reasons.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18705  Respondent: 15145377 / WYG (S Fidgett)  Agent:  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments  

5.25 We agree that new developments should provide the best sustainable travel options possible, and we consider that this is necessary for both sustainable development and prosperity. Development in unsustainable locations should be avoided and where unavoidable, should be required to provide for the essential infrastructure requirements needed to support the development.

5.26 The location of development is key in this regard and the commitment noted earlier in these representations, should be towards a sustainable spatial strategy that focuses development and growth to Guildford as the key town within the Borough and the location that maximises the benefit arising from investment in services and infrastructure and optimises the use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport modes.

5.27 We support the fact the policy outlines Park and Ride facilities as a form of sustainable travel, and that new development should secure appropriate improvements to public and community transport, including infrastructure and park and ride requirements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1443  Respondent: 15146945 / E J M Symonds  Agent:  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

I object most strongly to the last minute proposal with no prior warning. Our villages would become totally overwhelmed and snarled up with yet more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPP16/619  Respondent: 15147329 / Brenda Holliday  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have a little car but never use it between 7am-10am in the morning and 4pm-7pm in the evening because the A323 is jammed solid. With 2-cars per household and the proposed houses to be built in Ash, Tongham and Aldershot this equates to thousands of more cars using the A323. I think traffic lights or a roundabout will have to be built at the end of Westward Lane and Glaziers Lane because one would never be able to get onto the main Guildford to Aldershot Road. A road bridge at Ash station would be a good idea.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5328  Respondent: 15147841 / N Golbengian  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/646  Respondent: 15148705 / Catriona Wilkinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In particular I object to the following proposed sites:

Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch;

Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm Merrow;

Policy A35 Wisley

The combined effect of these substantial proposed developments within close proximity will place an unsustainable burden on the infrastructure of the areas affected. The surrounding roads are already extremely busy and in particular the resulting increase in traffic on the A3 and M25 will be disastrous. The A3 is already at a near standstill on the approach
to the M25 during the morning peak time and this will become substantially worse by the construction of upwards of four
and a half thousand houses, plus commercial/industrial units on these three sites combined.

I object to the proposal to create a four way junction on the A3 at Burnt Common (Policy 43A) by extending north and
south access as this will increase traffic enormously on the A247 which is already at full capacity through Send at peak
times and experiences huge traffic jams when even minor road works are required along its length. The proposal will
also increase the volume of traffic on the A247 through West Clandon which is totally unsuitable for any significant
volume of HGV traffic due to a very narrow stretch within the village where two large vehicles are unable to pass each
other.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the building of homes without due thought for school journeys. These represent a large proportion of traffic during rush hours, and the dependency of our children on parents to ferry them around. We should encourage housing to be built near schools or new schools to be built so that children can travel short distances by green transport.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/746  Respondent: 15155617 / David Vallath-Patel  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/752  Respondent: 15157089 / Louise Duncan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

They do not take into consideration the lack of schools & medical facilities but above all they will have a devastating effect on the A247. Plans already agreed – ie the Send Marina, & the additional houses on the Vision Engineering plot will be more than enough to bring this road to rush hour standstill & the Tannery Lane crossroads, already difficult for large commercial vehicles will become an even more hazardous accident spot.

The short section of the A247 between the Burnt Common roundabout & the new north & south A3 slip roads will have to absorb all this new local traffic but it will also attract those who currently go through Ripley.

A traffic survey of current levels would surely confirm that there are certain times of the day when one can take several minutes to gain access to the road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/781  Respondent: 15157601 / Barbara Walker  Agent:
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

As stated in my previous comment. The current infrastructure is unable to cope and provide a safe environment for people to walk or cycle in Horsley. The proposed development will exacerbate these problems and in reality people will not be able to safely walk or cycle around the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Roads and Drainage in East & West Horsley are in very poor condition and severely under pressure in our current environment. I have particular concerns about Ockham Road North with increased traffic this road will need better drainage and traffic calming measure which local residence have petitioned for with little success. Therefore I fear the dramatic increase in housing will cause even further problems as the Council have failed to resolve the existing issues therefore I do not see an evidence to show this will be improved in the future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/940  Respondent: 15183393 / D Greenman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This will ruin the rural environment of Send. The current infrastructure of Send cannot cope now with the existing population, any increase will have serious adverse effects upon the community.

The proposal of a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common is ridiculous, part from ruining the environment I green belt the extra traffic and in particular pollution will have a huge impact on Send.

All traffic from the M25 wishing to travel to Woking will be routed through Send, this cannot and will not be accepted.

Send is a small village and our main road A247 cannot cope now. There will be total grid lock!

As a resident of over 40 years I have seen Send deteriorate, Potters Lane has become a nightmare early in the morning and evening with the lane being used as a "Rat Run" for commuters to and from Woking/Guildford, its time that the A3 end of Potters Lane was closed and the Woodhill link to the old A3 made exit only.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/953  Respondent: 15184289 / V H Wood  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The A3, M25 and roads through the villages Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movement will result in more acute congestion and [text unreadable] pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/964  Respondent: 15184289 / V H Wood  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the congestion that development will cause to the local villages, roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy L1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the junction in the centre of Ripley. Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow.

With no proper pedestrian footpaths and no proper cycle lanes on the narrow roads, development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous.

I object due to the congestion that developments will cause to the [text unreadable] roads A3/M25 and the air quality. Environmental impact on amenity and health to the local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/977  Respondent: 15185729 / P H Brook  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

b) Safety matters. Most of the side roads are narrow and inadequate at times as it is. The pavements and footpaths (away from the High Street) are narrow and in bad repair.

Many people do still walk (they have to). In many cases there are home at all, or are very narrow.

And we have often have to share them with cyclists. This is a safety issue.

All this will be the consequence of the tremendous increase of houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/974  Respondent: 15185857 / Matthew Monk  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the local plan.

Despite the possible need for more houses to be built in this area, I believe that there are many disadvantages of this plan that far outweigh the benefits.

One of the main reasons I, along with many others, object to this plan, is that the increased number of houses will lead to higher levels of congestion. Even though more roads are being built congestion will still rise. This puts the safety of the children at local schools at higher risk. This backs up my argument as to why I object to the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Dear [Agent],

I am writing to object to the local plan. Despite the possible need for more houses to be built in this area, I believe that there are many disadvantages of this plan that far outweigh the benefits.

One of the main reasons I, along with many others, object to this plan, is that the increased number of houses will lead to higher levels of congestion. Even though more roads are being built congestion will still rise. This puts the safety of the children at local schools at higher risk. This backs up my argument as to why I object to the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

[Comment ID: PSLPP16/1023  Respondent: 15189377 / Anne Butler  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3 does not face reality. Developments outside the immediate village areas (eg that proposed for West Horsley) are not close enough to railway lines to encourage the use of public transport and will inevitably increase the number of cars on the local (overcrowded) roads. It is naive to suggest otherwise.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

[Comment ID: PSLPP16/1040  Respondent: 15192545 / M & JB Koskela  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Pedestrian and cyclists safety on crowded roads with no footway

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

[Comment ID: PSLPP16/1112  Respondent: 15195969 / Carrie Wheeler  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Pedestrian and cyclists safety on crowded roads with no footway

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to object most strongly to the proposed local plan. We have lived in Send Marsh since 1975. My husband had to commute to London for work, but we wanted to live in an area beyond the suburbs of the city, which had some open space. The proposed construction of hundreds of houses in and around Send Ripley Merrow and the Clandons, will create a density of housing and therefore increased traffic and pressure on local services that will mean we become a suburban area too!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/1119</th>
<th>Respondent: 15196097 / Mark Groves and Katie Hamilton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/1162</th>
<th>Respondent: 15197185 / Son Ruff</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are writing with reference to the 2016 draft local plan and wish to notify you of our objection to this.

Before any local housing developments in the proposed areas - Blackwell farm, Wisley, Slyfield, Send, Garlick's Arch - essential road infrastructure must take place, which includes building the A3 tunnel.

Before the building of Aldi in Burpham we could travel along New Inn Lane with some traffic congestion but ever since its construction (in order for us to get to Orchard Road) there is on average a 30 min plus queue all the way along that road during peak hours. This is because at the roundabout, there is a constant stream of traffic from the right (usually the A3 or from Jacobs Well) and as you have to give priority to the right, this lane of traffic hardly ever moves, particularly if you want to turn right to Sainsbury's or if you live along any of the side streets on London Road like we do. This is not effective or productive when you have two small children in the back of a car. We now have to resort to going along Merrow Lane as that is the only other access road and start queuing up with the A3 slip road traffic.

We have lived in Guildford for more than 10 years and although the housing developments continue there has been little investment in expanding the road infrastructure. We did feedback to the previous local plan and none of the proposals to alleviate congestion such as the roundabout in Merrow at the top of Park Lane were implemented, i.e. make the roundabout a small hump which can be driven over as those coming from Clandon that want to turn right cannot do so because of those coming from Burpham who want to turn right and then clog up the roundabout.
It is the only town in the UK that has a hideous system of one way access points to and from the A3 which forces many people to travel past Ladymead just to join the A3 southbound.

The proposed local housing developments will add 6000+ homes without much change to infrastructure. Already it takes more than 30 mins to travel anywhere around Guildford. Do you really want Guildford to be renowned for its stupid road infrastructure? We will become the laughing stock of the south.

The plan also shows a disproportionate level of housing development in these areas, coupled with a limited consultation period, lack of any detail on essential infrastructure and lack of evidence for alleged housing numbers which has more than doubled from the previous figure in 2012.

A positive decision on the A3 tunnel needs to be taken before Gosden Hill and the other areas can be earmarked for development.

We urge you to consult in an appropriate period and to think of the hellish lives of residents and future generations should you implement this plan without the required road infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1169  Respondent: 15197761 / M B Kelly  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

To the Planning Policy (Local Plan Consultation)

I am writing to object to the Draft Local Plan for Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill Farm and Garlicks Arch.

There will be chaos in the area with the proposed new traffic and new sliproads onto Burnt Common roundabout. The A3/M25 is already a very traffic spot and getting gradually worse putting a strain on the adjoining roads. We already have an influx of cyclists and heavy traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1184  Respondent: 15198337 / Jack Tallick  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16403  Respondent: 15216129 / Timothy Hewlett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1298  Respondent: 15216321 / Douglas Ollington  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Congestion on the A3 and M25 trunk roads

I object to the development of the strategic sites due to the A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
12. We object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The scale of the proposed development is mind blowing, we really do not have the infrastructure in place to support so many houses, specifically, schools, nurseries, doctors surgeries, etc.

Many of the local roads are single track roads which will be totally unable to support increased traffic flows.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):

• Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
• Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
• Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. I.e. most residents!
• Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1470  Respondent: 15233889 / Claire Sallows  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This in turn creates my further objection to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

As the huge developments proposed (particularly in the north east of the borough) will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1486  Respondent: 15234273 / Martin Jones  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have reviewed the plans proposed with regards to the revision of areas currently within the green belt and feel these plans are unacceptable due to the following:

1. I object due to the congestion that the proposed development will have on an already over loaded road network. I feel changes to existing trunk roads especially A3/M25 will have to be made prior to further development being considered/ suggested. Moreover the rural roads around Ripley, send and Clandon are already overloaded with through traffic. These are narrow and in poor condition. Most don't currently have a footpath nor cycle path. There is no plan to improve these hence I object.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1556  Respondent: 15234849 / Alastair Fleming  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

17. I object to the impact of further congestion on local village roads and lanes.

18. I object to the impact of excessive development on the A3 and M2S on air quality. The air quality in many parts of the borough is greater than EU permitted levels and will damage the health of residents and future residents.
19. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are designated on Green Belt land along the A3. This will result in gridlock on the A3, the A247 and the surrounding roads which are already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1587  Respondent: 15239297 / T Fleming  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

17. I object to the impact of further congestion on local village roads and lanes.

18. I object to the impact of excessive development on the A3 and M25 on air quality. The air quality in many parts of the borough is greater than EU permitted levels and will damage the health of residents and future residents.

19. I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are designated on Green Belt land along the A3. This will result in gridlock on the A3, the A247 and the surrounding roads which are already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1621  Respondent: 15240161 / R O Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

11. Poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to further congestion and greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on the health of local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1643  Respondent: 15240929 / P. A. Finch  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I have lived in the Ripley area for 46 years and therefore list below all my objections to the proposed developments at Garlicks Arch, Wisley and Gosden Hill.

1 I object to the congestion this will cause. There are no railway stations in Ripley and Wisley and no reliable bus service. This will result in an increase of road traffic as everyone will be using cars. The local roads are narrow and in bad repair.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1753</th>
<th>Respondent: 15244641 / Wesley Raynbird-Tilbury</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY I3 - Sustainable transport for new developments**

I OBJECT. This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general "modal shift" from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent—just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust.

One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day, as I used to do. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.
Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1866</th>
<th>Respondent: 15248481 / Jamie McCallister</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)
The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1911</th>
<th>Respondent: 15253217 / W Orchard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1940</th>
<th>Respondent: 15254113 / R Orchard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13708  Respondent: 15254337 / Ben Warwick  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13714  Respondent: 15254337 / Ben Warwick  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy12)

Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1952  Respondent: 15254785 / M.D. Vickers  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2068  Respondent: 15263073 / James Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12.1 OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2086  Respondent: 15263905 / Philip Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12.1 OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9907  Respondent: 15263937 / Jim Holloway  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1200</th>
<th>Respondent: 15264001 / Robert Peake</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My biggest concerns are extra traffic congestion especially in central guildford and with that would come horrendous parking issues. Guildford town centre is already lacking in adequate parking sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14927</th>
<th>Respondent: 15265377 / Emma Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.1 OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2161</th>
<th>Respondent: 15268641 / Sandy Homewood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy i3: Sustainable Transport for new developments.

Developers will be expected to propose and secure travel Plans for their developments and contribute to transport arrangements for the able and disabled.

I can’t think of a single developer who would get even remotely close to achieving this, when it will be at odds with their profit potential. Development history has taught us that scant regards is taken for the community when it comes to development and profit making.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2258  Respondent: 15274945 / Philip Grainger  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Measuring transport Monitoring Indicators every ten years is not in my opinion adequate. This should be done at more regular intervals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2497  Respondent: 15275009 / Compton Parish Council (Fiona Curtis)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments This is aspirational, the modal shift aim being worthwhile, but the realities are quite different. The policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport. The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want to build across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Other areas have lost their bus service or it has been cut and many villages have a service which is infrequent. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are slow and lack predictability due to the congested roads. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths. The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK. The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times. Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and
others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town. We like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services. The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented. Ie.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times. Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town. We like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services. The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented. Ie. Cost of housing will increase.

Who is the 'sustainable corridor' for if the vast majority of people are to live outside the town and are unable to walk or cycle to Guildford because of all the factors already mentioned, including lack of pavements and safe cycle routes? If more people lived in the town then this might be justifiable but as it is, it is unclear who will really benefit from it?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11915  Respondent: 15275201 / Jennifer Morritt  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17642  Respondent: 15278369 / Ripley Parish Council (Jim Morris)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Traffic and Transport
29. There is no realistic proposal in the Plan for the provision of enhanced public transport, which could lead to significant modal shift. By the nature of the rural road network, the resulting substantial increase in road traffic would be likely to cause either (a) increased traffic on inappropriate rural roads; and/or (b) pressure to expand highway capacity with resulting urbanisation of the rural area.

30. The impact of these large scale principally housing developments (A43 Garlick’s Arch, A25 Gosden Hill, A35 Land at Wisley Airfield and A36-A41 Horsleys) on the roads around Ripley are likely to lead to unacceptable levels of traffic that cannot be mitigated due to the nature of the country lanes around Ripley and the listed buildings within the conservation area of Ripley.

31. They are also likely to add significantly to traffic on the already congested A3. Highways England have stated that the A3 north of Guildford to M25 is already at capacity in both directions in the peak hour. This problem will be exacerbated by the substantial new housing proposed for the rural area north of Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18680  Respondent: 15278465 / Chris Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14690  Respondent: 15278849 / Giordano Mion  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have been examining Guildford proposed development plan and, while I am happy more housing has been planned, I am concerned about sufficient improvement in the transportation network being able to accommodate for more people and cars. The situation is already far from ideal, including parking, and I hope it does not get any worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Paragraph 4.6.21 confirms that Policy I3 promotes the use of sustainable transport modes to ensure ‘safe and suitable access will be achieved and improvements will be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development’. This strategy concentrates on walking and cycling access, the use of public and community transport and the promotion of Park & Ride, to be paid for by developers and by CIL.

Miller maintains that without significant investment in the local highway network it is difficult to prioritise public transport and Park & Ride as a sustainable mode. Whilst the Council has committed to its Sustainable Movement Corridor (paragraph 4.6.24) it is not understood how the proposed ‘rapid and reliable’ routes for buses or to the rail stations can be provided, or what the cost of these improvements is likely to be. Whilst the routes may have been identified, paragraph 4.6.25 makes it abundantly clear that these improvements are at present ‘aspirational’ at best:

‘The measures applicable to each development proposal will vary on a case-by-case basis, according to the type and scale of development proposed, its location, and the level of existing transport infrastructure and services in the immediate area. This could also include a financial contribution for the implementation of schemes beyond the scope of an individual development to deliver’.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):
• Generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
• Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
• Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. I.e. most residents!
• Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan.

I live in Burpham, very close to the A3 and the traffic is already extremely heavy, often coming to a complete standstill. Building the proposed number of new homes in Burpham, Slyfield, Ripley, Send, Clandon, etc. all close to the A3 and Guildford will mean movement of traffic will become much worse. Guildford already becomes gridlocked when the A3 or the A25 is extra slow. I suggest better road facilities should be decided and developed before more development is undertaken.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2538  Respondent: 15283969 / Phil Ballance  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We live in New Inn Lane and are writing to object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan. Guildford is becoming grid locked at certain times of the day as it is due to the volumes of traffic and the inadequate infrastructure.

The other day or took me nearly an hour to drive from Burpham to Royal Surrey Hospital at 5pm to pick my wife up from work. Every morning and evening Guildford almost stops so to even consider building 2,000 new homes which means at least 4,000 additional cars on the road without massive investment in the roads, seems madness.

We, along with 300 others objected to the building of Aldi in Burpham due to increased traffic and again the council did not listen and this has made the area a lot worse. You cannot park in Kingspost parade at certain times due to Aldi customers using it as an overflow car park, something that was not even considered as part of the planning approval.

The houses that were built in Raynham Close provided inadequate parking, as all new housing developments seem to these days and therefore you now have a parking problem in Burnet Avenue.

The bottom line is there are far too many houses and cars in Burpham without building anymore and a new railway station will compound the problem not solve it.

The strategy to cram as many houses into an existing area is not a plan, it's purely focusing on meeting government targets rather than what is best for the long term good of the area. Unless the problem is dealt with in a sensible planned way you will just create more problems down the line which is where this is heading.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2567  Respondent: 15284993 / Samantha Thompson  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to poor air quality concerns(Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2581  Respondent: 15285121 / Audrey Boughton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2596  Respondent: 15285345 / Mike Boughton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3646  Respondent: 15292129 / Shirley Wilson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to these plans to as the roads cannot cope with more traffic. There are often queues of traffic in rush hour and this will only get worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2661  Respondent: 15294113 / M J Hickman  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposals for new roads which will exacerbate the existing traffic problems such as the access to Wisley Gardens, and the local villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2671  Respondent: 15295329 / Matt Sage  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Our second objection is regarding the local infrastructure. We are far from convinced that the proposed road improvements to cope with the planned developments are adequate. The addition of some 6000 homes to this area of the borough will inevitably add massively to the number of cars using both the A3 trunk road and the local roads in Burpham and into the town centre. Driving to work as we do have noticed over the last 10 years a huge increase in traffic and the A3 simply cannot cope any longer with queues regularly reaching back to before the Burpham exit and the London road toward Guildford constantly moves at a snails pace. Even weekend traffic is now becoming noticeably heavier and a slight incident such as an accident or heavy rain brings the whole road network to a standstill extremely quickly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2690  Respondent: 15295809 / David Lees  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to worsening air quality.

It is not appropriate to inflict upon local residents the greater levels of air pollution that the developments proposed and the associated further traffic congestion will cause.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to poor air quality concerns.

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the destruction of areas that are currently home to natural flora and fauna displacing animals and birds.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the added noise of traffic that will be created by the increased volume of traffic.

4) I object to the extension of hours of noisy traffic that will be created by people trying to avoid the queues that already build up on A3 and M25. People get up earlier and earlier to get ahead of the traffic jams on these roads.

5) I object to the increased pollution from traffic fumes from extra cars. The pollution levels are already too high, and cause sore throats.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the increased traffic volume which would cause children, who already take 1 hour to get home from school on the bus between Guildford and Ripley, to take even longer.

9) I object to the danger caused by more cars on roads which are also used by over sized buses. On the narrow lanes of Send the width of the buses cross the center lane demarcation. On blind corners as in Send Marsh, the bus rounds the corner in the same lane as those heading in the opposite direction. Accidents are hard to avoid.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15475  Respondent: 15297249 / Christine Gates  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3) I object to the added noise of traffic that will be created by the increased volume of traffic.

4) I object to the extension of hours of noisy traffic that will be created by people trying to avoid the queues that already build up on A3 and M25. People get up earlier and earlier to get ahead of the traffic jams on these roads.

5) I object to the increased pollution from traffic fumes from extra cars. The pollution levels are already too high, and cause sore throats.

7) I object to the disproportionate amount of development proposed for one area of the borough. Already the traffic flow problems around Guildford, Ripley, Cobham, Byfleet are horrendous in rush hour, building up from 3.30 pm and reaching virtual gridlock by 5pm. As residents we already feel imprisoned between 7.30am to 9am and 3.30pm to 6.30pm because the roads are clogged with traffic.

8) I object to the increased traffic volume which would cause children, who already take 1 hour to get home from school on the bus between Guildford and Ripley, to take even longer.

9) I object to the danger caused by more cars on roads which are also used by over sized buses. On the narrow lanes of Send the width of the buses cross the center lane demarcation. On blind corners as in Send Marsh, the bus rounds the corner in the same lane as those heading in the opposite direction. Accidents are hard to avoid.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2764  Respondent: 15298017 / Margaret Cousins  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2780  Respondent: 15298497 / John David Scott  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health, including mine and my family’s.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14233  Respondent: 15299201 / Samira Abdullah  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments  This is another aspirational policy, not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport. The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths. The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK. The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially
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unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times. Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town. I like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services. The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented. Ie. Cost of housing will increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2861  Respondent: 15300385 / Mark Harding  Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2880  Respondent: 15301089 / Brian Yeomans  Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3: Sustainable transport for new developments

I OBJECT to this policy.

- The practicalities of sustainable transport have not been properly considered, it is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable. Not everyone can cycle all the time.
- Large developments outside the town centre cannot maximise sustainable travel. The further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.
- Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle – and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?
The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a hoppa bus can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2952  Respondent: 15304897 / Richard Baker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2998  Respondent: 15304929 / Rosemary Wood  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns.

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that 'Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.’ The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3013  Respondent: 15312769 / Norah Johnson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health, no investigations have been disclosed to the local population if any have been carried out.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1535</th>
<th>Respondent: 15312769 / Norah Johnson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3029</th>
<th>Respondent: 15312961 / Alison Johnson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health, no investigations have been disclosed to the local population if any have been carried out.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3050</th>
<th>Respondent: 15314305 / Andrew Dennis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)**

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3070  **Respondent:** 15314817 / Mr and Mrs Daniels  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

6) **WE OBJECT TO** the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3072  **Respondent:** 15314881 / Gill Haig-Brown  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

2) This proposed development will further congest our roads

   - Travel time to work along the A3 has increased dramatically over the past 2 years,
   - My business has suffered as patients are unable to arrive on time for early appointments
   - The slightest problem on the major access roads causes huge gridlock and traffic chaos again impacting my business
   - Appointments have been lost due to this congestion resulting in reduced business efficiency
   - Extra load on the road from the proposed development can only add to the problem and will seriously mean my consideration of relocating away from Guildford.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/3081  **Respondent:** 15315009 / Edward Dennis  **Agent:**
1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**The University and Its Town**

The relationship between the University of Surrey and Guildford Borough Council goes back to the early 1960s when the Borough supported its own development by attracting the University of Surrey to relocate to the town.

Today the University and the companies on its Research Park bring £1.7bn of gross added value to the UK each year and directly or indirectly support 17,312 UK jobs, 10,644 of them in Guildford. The University is ranked 4th in the country in the Guardian 2016 and 2017 league Tables and was awarded the University of the Year Status by The Times/The Sunday Times in 2016. The wholly-owned Surrey Sports Park attracts international teams and high-profile events and is appreciated by local residents who pay well in excess of 3/4 million visits to the park each year.

The University, the Research Park companies, the Royal Surrey County Hospital and Guildford Business Park are located in an area of roughly a square mile to the west of Guildford Town Centre. This square mile covers less than 1% of Guildford Borough but generates around 45% of the Gross Value Added of the Borough. The experience of the many staff working in the square mile and the University students is affected by housing and infrastructure deficits and the University’s plans and this response reflect that context.

The underpinning need for the local Plan is clear:

- Population growth in this area is rapid and this will continue
- The UK is already in housing crisis, with the younger and future generations particularly badly affected
- The housing crisis is particularly serious in the South East and in this Borough
- The economy must be allowed to grow to deal with the country's debt burden and population growth
- To enable economic and housing growth, infrastructure deficits must be tackled
- Guildford is an integral part of the dynamic fast growth area of London and the South

It cannot distance itself from that growth and cannot avoid dealing with the consequences of it.

The University is, of course, acutely aware both of the social costs of growth, and of the infrastructural deficits that our town has to contend with. Investments by the University in student accommodation over the past ten years are approaching £130m (including £85m in new accommodation); a further sum of around £75m is due to be spent delivering 1,150 new units over the next three years and further accommodation will be built to support new demand as funds permit.

The University is also all too familiar with local infrastructural deficits and has itself had to contend with well-documented traffic and parking issues and restrictions. The University’s own investment in transport infrastructure and on public transport subsidies has cost many millions over the past ten years, not least for the new Egerton Road Junction. It has always been known that this junction was just part of a more comprehensive solution which would need to include access to the West through a road across Blackwell Farm to the A31. That new road infrastructure would benefit the University, the Research Park, the Hospital and Guildford town itself, and the development of Blackwell Farm provides an excellent opportunity to deliver and fund those essential improvements.
**POLICY I3 - Sustainable transport for new developments**

I OBJECT. This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust.

One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3359</th>
<th>Respondent: 15329441 / Suzie Powell-Cullingford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to the traffic congestion caused by the ribbon of development along the A3, specifically from Policy A35 Wisley Airfield, Policy A43 Garlick's Arch, Policy A25 Gosden Hill and Policy A26 Blackwell Farm (Policy I2). Highways England do not have any provision to even examine the A3 until at least 2020, therefore it is entirely possible that GBC will undertake massive housing construction before any road infrastructure has even been discussed, let alone planned and built. This is completely unacceptable for the many thousands of existing residents who will be impacted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3448</th>
<th>Respondent: 15340929 / Claire Smylie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3615</th>
<th>Respondent: 15342401 / M.J. Harris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Transport

Your Transport 2016 report states “Existing road and parking infrastructure is already inadequate or under pressure and would worsen with the planned development, reducing quality of life, particularly in:... Send, particularly Potters Lane, ...”. Therefore, I object because all the proposed developments in Send (A42, A43, A44, and particularly A43a) with have asignificant negative effecton the transport infrastructure, which your consultants say is already inadequate.

Sustainability

I object to all the proposed housing developments in Send (A42, A43, A44) because they will all promote the opposite of “encouraging sustainable forms of transport”, “conserving landscape character”, and “providing housing to meet local needs”, and most of the other Sustainability criteria. I object because, obviously as a resident ,I can see for myself that local amenities at present are either inadequate or under strain, and therefore will not meet the required Sustainability criteria with the influx of another thousand or so people. The Sustainability report 2016 seems just to pay vague lip-service to GBC plans, rather than being properly fact-based, truthful, and pragmatic on these matters.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3680  Respondent: 15344737 / Alex Bell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Transport

As it is now, there are insufficient parking spaces at both Horsley and Effingham stations. If you arrive after 09:00 and need to go to a meeting in London then there is nowhere left to park your car and all of the local roads nearby have parking restrictions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3687  Respondent: 15345025 / John Weaver  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
There are also other facilities and services that just could not cope with the increase in population and traffic. Horsley railway station car park and bicycle bay is full every week day and there is limited parking for the village shops, library, bank, and restaurants. Traffic congestion, parking queues, and frustrated drivers will be the inevitable result with all the attendant safety concerns. There is also a capacity problem with the village waste water system which periodically overflows flooding local roads. Thames Water has already advised you that the system will be unable to support the additional demand, but no mention in the plan for upgrading it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3752</th>
<th>Respondent: 15345281 / Alexandra Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that &quot;Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.&quot; The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3732</th>
<th>Respondent: 15345601 / Ray Salim</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to raise my objections to the proposed local plans for housing development at Wisley Airfield and throughout the Horsley villages. This is based on the following;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and parking:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assuming that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a three mile radius of the villages. The impact on local roads will be tremendous. Parking at Horsley &amp; Effingham junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be affected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Road Network:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is almost inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3737  Respondent: 15345601 / Ray Salim  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Transport: Misery for commuters, nowhere to park and overcrowded trains at commuting times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3769  Respondent: 15347937 / Margaret Brazier  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. West Horsley already cannot cope with its extremely poor road system- badly maintained with countless pot holes and rough surfaces.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3993  Respondent: 15347937 / Margaret Brazier  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The current plan could increase the village population by something like 1,500 people and the number of cars by an extra 700 – 800. The totally neglected road network in the village is insufficient at present for the volume of traffic because The Street through the centre of the village is a convenient short cut for A246 traffic from the Guildford direction heading for the A3 and the M25. And there is no general public car park in West Horsley. What are the Council’s proposals for coping with this already acute problem?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3790  Respondent: 15348033 / Peter Nicholas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3800</th>
<th>Respondent: 15348321 / Vivien Sale</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT due to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3).

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on the health of local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3802</th>
<th>Respondent: 15348321 / Vivien Sale</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic problems: Getting into Guildford during busy times takes ages. The town centre is often gridlocked as it is. Parking can be a nightmare.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3804</th>
<th>Respondent: 15348321 / Vivien Sale</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transport: There is already insufficient road and rail capacity for Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3800</th>
<th>Respondent: 15348321 / Vivien Sale</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this I belong to The Tyting Society, which has a particular interest in preserving the local AONB (area of outstanding natural beauty) for future generations, with single track lanes which cannot cope with additional traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3888</th>
<th>Respondent: 15349281 / Steve Aptel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)**

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13652</th>
<th>Respondent: 15349281 / Steve Aptel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/204</th>
<th>Respondent: 15349281 / Steve Aptel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Both my husband and myself object strongly to the 2016 Draft Local Plan for the following reasons:— 1, An extremely large number of houses to be built in a relatively small area of Guildford which will completely change the villages and their contribution and ambiance of living in the area. If that number of houses are built there will be an enormous increase in the number of cars and general traffic in and around Guildford. The infrastructure cannot cope with the traffic at present and if on average every house has 2 cars this will increase this by up to 12000 regularly using the roads making it frustrating and dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Lack of details on essential infrastructure – the local schools have already expanded to take the existing capacity, doctors’, and the Royal Surrey are already stretched. The roads around Burpham and Guildford cannot cope with the existing amount of traffic – there are frequently delays getting into and out of Guildford as the A3 around the University and Royal Surrey are unable to cope. This leads to congestion around the Wooden Bridge, Ladymead and Stoke junctions. Any problems on the A3 cause all the traffic to come through Burpham which already has jams and congestion at rush hour along the London Road and Clay Lane without any additional traffic. In addition, the current roads are in a poor state of repair in many places.

The noise levels from the A3 and other local roads is already high – more traffic will make this worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. **Lack of planned infrastructure.**

The Plan does not make provision for increasing the availability of public transport alternatives to private motor vehicle use, especially for additional places on local commuter trains or in station car parks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4012  **Respondent:** 15351617 / Patricia George  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan for the following reasons: 

**Infrastructure:**

1. The Aldi roundabout is frequently gridlocked. When the Aldi juggernaut lorries make deliveries it is impossible for local residents to gain access to their houses. Additional traffic from the Gosden Hill development would exacerbate the situation. You have not provided a clear plan of how you will widen the roads and Aldi roundabout or how the additional traffic would access the A3.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4054  **Respondent:** 15353217 / Vali Drummond  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is simply not the infrastructure in place for this to happen

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4062  **Respondent:** 15353441 / Sue Storr  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to put in writing that I object most strongly to the GBC's Local draft Plan 2016 - this will have an horrendous impact of the traffic through Burpham - and will completely ruin the lives of the inhabitants.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4073  **Respondent:** 15353633 / Neal Stone  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Potholes on East Lane have not been attended to in the year that we’ve lived here (despite reporting them) with existing traffic levels. And yet the plan proposes to add 35% more households into the

Horsleys? Imagine the increased use that our roads will take, not to mention the jump in traffic noise, road safety and pollution. Even with only one car per household (and most rural households seem to have at least two cars given public transport is so poor) that is an increase of 3000 cars in our immediate area alone. Have you ever tried to park at Horsley or Effingham Junction station in the rush hour, or had to wait for a space to park by the East Horsley shops? Our wonderful Horsley Medical Centre already seems to be running at capacity, with some waits at times to be seen. More households will add additional strain on already overstretched services locally and regionally. Have you ever seen the car park at Royal Surrey hospital mid morning or had to wait in A&E at Royal Surrey with a toddler? How many more consultants, registrars and nursing staff at Royal Surrey have been allowed for in your plans?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4082  Respondent: 15353633 / Neal Stone  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. I OBJECT to Policy I3: which ignores the current scarcity of rural transport and makes no mention of the dilapidated state of Surrey’s roads. The policy ignores the additional strains placed on the transport system by the thousands of houses proposed. For the railway, where are the suggested longer platforms, or more frequent trains, or early or late services, or toilets on rolling stock to support the plan?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4132  Respondent: 15355361 / Jennifer Brockless  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

No thought seems to have been given to the traffic congestion that will inevitably ensue; the only station with a good service to London is Woking, and anyone who travels to Woking from the Ripley, Send or Clandon areas will have already experienced the frustrating drive to Woking Station - the roads are not good enough for the present traffic let alone the additional traffic from the proposed development. Increased air pollution will also result from extra traffic.

Many of the local lanes have no pavements or paths for pedestrians and are narrow. Any increase in traffic (especially lorry traffic) will bring real danger to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. The provision of cycle lanes is sporadic.

The poor state of repair of many of these roads seems to indicate that The Council already finds maintaining them difficult; a greatly increased volume of traffic will inevitably stretch resources even further.

This development is out of all proportion in relation to the currently existing infrastructure. Where are the plans that detail how this infrastructure problem will be solved?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
2). We are already overloaded with cars, it is difficult to park for shopping in Station Parade and our roads are much too narrow for the large lorries which are even now encountered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

3) The congestion in Burpham leading up to the A3 junctions will be extreme and needs to be dealt with before so many houses are built increasing the

the number of cars using the roads by at least double.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

12. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The traffic in Send is already unbearable during the busy periods in the morning, we are constantly congested on Send Barnes lane and I cannot imagine how difficult it would be with more vehicles on the road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to all the plans proposed and am at a loss to understand your willingness to consider send at all with all the congestion and traffic gridlock we have already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

However, prior to this development plan carried out, we definitely and urgently need new roads and transport system to accommodate this future expansion of the area. I've already felt that roads in Guildford get busier and less efficient, and I'm very much concerned about more traffic jams not only during peak times but also anytime and everywhere in Guildford once the housing development in the planned areas are in the full swing and in complete.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to houses being built on Clockbarn Nursery and Send Hill. Both areas have small country roads and are already busy enough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID: PSLPP16/4226  Respondent: 15357761 / Ross Haimes  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Transport**

The road transport network is currently not fit for purpose. I am stuck in traffic every evening for a significant time trying to complete my journey home, this is mainly due to heavy congestion on the A3 and poor connection to / from the A3 in the Burpham area. The current road network needs to be upgraded to be suitable for the existing population before considering adding 5,000+ additional cars to the local roads that would be caused by the new homes, industry and park & ride proposed at Gosden Hill Farm. I understand that a tunnel under Guildford is being considered underneath the 50 mph section of the A3, the proposed location at Gosden Hill Farm would be the most sensible entry point for this tunnel so it is very short sighted to develop this land for houses. Improvements to the A3 like the proposed tunnel under Guildford are required to be implemented before even considering building any more houses in the local area. The A3100 London Road is the intended entry point to this new development at Gosden Hill Farm, this will become two way and all traffic heading north on the A3 will be routed south down the A3100 to the Clay Lane slip road. This will lead to very heavy congestion around the Burpham roundabouts and all roads into Burpham. New Inn Lane and the A3100 are currently grid locked every evening due to rush-hour traffic, the development at Gosden Hill Farm will add 5,000+ more cars and cause significantly more inconvenience to everyone who uses these road systems. Improvements to the current road network in Burpham are required to be implemented before even considering building more houses in the local area. As a minimum any new development would need to include a 4 way A3 interchange north of Burpham around Potters Lane, this should be included as part of the future tunnel project. The Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) and Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC) do not take account of the current narrow road limitations, pinch points or include adequate information regarding congestion and as such the Local Plan should be considered unsound. Congestion is clearly going to be very severe and make travel round Burpham impossible at certain times of day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/4242  Respondent: 15358305 / Frances Hodgson  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)**

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/4283  Respondent: 15358753 / Adam Lewis  Agent:**

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. We object to Policy S1 not offering sustainable development as regards roads and rail infrastructure which currently does not cope with demand, congestion on the A3 in particular, but also other A roads in the area such as the A247, the A246 and then there is the already overcrowded and slow train system for those already living in the borough and needing to commute to London. No pre-emptive planning has been made to alleviate these real problems which will be much exacerbated by large increases in housing.

We specifically want you to note the winding, narrow and dangerous route via the A247 through West Clandon which then drives people to use a cut-out with the even narrower rural road, the Ripley Road, through East Clandon to and from the A3. This will be much exacerbated with the large increase in housing twinned with large increase in cars and travel.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4298</th>
<th>Respondent: 15358913 / Lisa Lewis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I **object** to the fact that infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels – roads, doctors, schools will not be able to cope.
2. I **object** that housing being proposed on the Green Belt will increase traffic bringing increased danger and pollution and slower journey times on our already overcrowded village roads.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4293</th>
<th>Respondent: 15359009 / Will Bowen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to lodge an objection to the 2016 Draft Local Plan, which I believe to be poorly thought through in terms of housing need and proposed infrastructure.

Most importantly, I believe that we must have clarity on the viability of a much-needed tunnel taking the A3 underneath Guildford before committing to building on Gosden Hill Farm, where the tunnel is likely to begin/end.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4301</th>
<th>Respondent: 15359105 / Nicki Bowen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to lodge an objection to the 2016 Draft Local Plan on the basis of housing need and proposed infrastructure. I feel that greater understanding around the building of a tunnel and entry/exit points needs to be confirmed before a deeper plan around housing and amenities can be developed further.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4302  **Respondent:** 15359137 / George Sprankling  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

my objections to the proposed housing development plans for the Horsleys.

I object to the increase in pressure on the services such as, schools, drainage, roads and car parks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4317  **Respondent:** 15359329 / Andrew & Elizabeth Robinson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Highways Agency has already judged that the access from the A3 to the Horsley/Wisley area is not sufficient to cope with the likely increase in traffic volume from proposed developments. Ockham Road and Forest Road are narrow “B” roads and there is no scope for any effective improvement. The increase in traffic will cause significant local problems, resulting in other, even more minor, local roads being used as “rat-runs” to avoid key junctions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9582  **Respondent:** 15360321 / Jean Miller  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that the traffic impact of the Plan on Compton has been effectively ignored. With the proposed developments at Blackwell Farm (1,800 homes), Normandy (1,000 homes), Ash (1,300 homes) and proposed developments at Aldershot and Bordon, the increase in traffic on the B3000 in Compton is likely to be severe. In fact, the
Highways Assessment ranks the B3000 only just below the major A roads and Trunk roads in terms of negative traffic impact. No solutions or steps to achieve some mitigation are offered and I therefore strongly object to the level of building proposed in the Plan and would question why no constraint to the numbers proposed had been applied to reflect this major issue.

Still on the subject of the B3000, GBC has undertaken NO2 readings for a number of properties on the Street (B3000) in Compton. I am aware that one property on the B3000 has exceeded the recommended limit. This fact is known to GBC and I object to the Air Quality problem in Compton not being referred to in the Plan. This is particularly relevant bearing in mind the forecast additional traffic Compton will be getting (see paragraph 6 above).

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4818  **Respondent:** 15377793 / Robin Dabbs  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO IMPROVED PUBLIC TRANSPORT FACILITIES & ACCESS NOT BEING PRIORITISED BEFORE BUILDING IS STARTED

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4820  **Respondent:** 15377793 / Robin Dabbs  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO IMPROVED PUBLIC TRANSPORT FACILITIES & ACCESS NOT BEING PRIORITISED BEFORE BUILDING IS STARTED

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4815  **Respondent:** 15377825 / Christopher Dabbs  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO IMPROVED PUBLIC TRANSPORT FACILITIES & ACCESS NOT BEING PRIORITISED BEFORE BUILDING IS STARTED

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4837  **Respondent:** 15377953 / cctvtraining.com ltd (Gordon Tyerman)  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO IMPROVED PUBLIC TRANSPORT FACILITIES & ACCESS NOT BEING PRIORITISED BEFORE BUILDING IS STARTED

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
POLICY I3 Sustainable transport for new developments

GROUND FOR OBJECTION We support the concept of sustainable transport but object on the grounds that the practicalities have not been properly considered,

It is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable.

Not everyone can cycle all the time.

How can large developments outside the town centre maximise sustainable travel? This is a matter for the planning process- the further from the town centre, the less sustainable the development will be.

Reliance on cycling discriminates against vulnerable members of the community. How can the disabled, those with small children, or the very old, or the infirm, or those who are ill, cycle outside the town in order to commute, or even inside the town? Only some people cycle –and Guildford has some steep hills, especially going out of town. Park and rides are slow – how can those with a 3 hour commute add 1 hour to their journey from using park and rides?

The only sustainable mechanism for new developments is to have them in the town centre close to the railway and the main shopping links where a “hoppa bus” can provide satisfactory links for those who cannot walk or cycle.

While we welcome the intention to encourage rail travel by adding two new stations (subject to negotiation with Network Rail) there could unintended consequences.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/4962</th>
<th>Respondent: 15381249 / Helen Poyntz</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. POLICY I3</td>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5004</th>
<th>Respondent: 15382529 / Reuben Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I OBJECT to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, already suffer from traffic congestion. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With some 5,000 houses being proposed close to the village of Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Document page number | 1887 |
These narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians AND you have given no consideration to this point.

The council has a statutory obligation to protect the public and the additional traffic flows will bring added pollution and risk to injury of the public. In the case of West Clandon the Street often only has a narrow footpath on one side of the road making it very dangerous, especially when vehicles mount the pavements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5014  Respondent: 15382529 / Reuben Lee  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

16. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5124  Respondent: 15386017 / Gareth Sinnett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The link road that runs through the village of West Clandon (A247) is currently a 'hazardous' road as highlighted in a traffic survey, and only today there has been yet another accident on this road with the colliding vehicles mounting the pavement. At present, infant school children walking to the small local school are forced to walk along narrow pavements close to a road which is unsuited to the volume and type of traffic that uses it. Last week my wife had to jump across the pavement to avoid being hit by a lorry who drove up onto the pavement to avoid another passing the other way, and had her own car struck by another travelling at speed a few months ago. Large vehicles such as lorries and buses are frequently seen mounting the pavements at significant speeds to avoid collisions with one another and will no doubt in time lead to serious injury or death. A development as proposed in the local plan will significantly increase the likelihood of this occurring, as a direct result of the obvious increase in traffic in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5135  Respondent: 15386017 / Gareth Sinnett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11.  POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5154  Respondent: 15386337 / Edna Slater  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.  POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5169  Respondent: 15388385 / Linda Bagnall  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/5180  Respondent: 15388641 / Eva Hay  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5182  Respondent: 15388673 / Bruce Stewart  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Response to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan. The worst aspect of this is the additional traffic through Merrow, Guildford, Ripley, Clandon and on the A3. I commute by motorbike so I can more or less get through the traffic – but I see the chaos caused every day. Only today, there was an accident with a car pulling out of a drive in Clandon and immediately causing a two way jam over a mile long through the village in each direction. It is unworkable now. Please understand these roads cannot sustain the even greater impact of even more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5196  Respondent: 15388673 / Bruce Stewart  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5211</th>
<th>Respondent: 15388865 / Andrew Powell-Cullingford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7952</th>
<th>Respondent: 15388865 / Andrew Powell-Cullingford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to poor air quality concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5297</th>
<th>Respondent: 15389697 / Oliver Stewart</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the fact that the infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels, with such a large increase in housing the roads will not be able to accommodate the huge increase in traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5311</th>
<th>Respondent: 15389697 / Oliver Stewart</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5349  Respondent: 15390401 / William Stewart  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that the infrastructure has not been properly assessed and is inadequate to deal with current housing levels, with such a large increase in housing the roads will not be able to accommodate the huge increase in traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5361  Respondent: 15390401 / William Stewart  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5398  Respondent: 15390785 / Francesca Molossi- Murphy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5381  Respondent: 15390881 / Richard Goodworth  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my objection to the 2016 Draft Local Plan, which I believe has not been thoroughly thought through in terms of housing need and proposed infrastructure.

Furthermore, I believe it is important that we have clarity on the viability of a tunnel taking the A3 underneath Guildford before committing to building on Gosden Hill Farm, where the tunnel is likely to begin/end.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5394  Respondent: 15391041 / Anne Lawrence  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Allowing Green Belt development to pay for transport schemes will simply generate yet more traffic from more homes, fuelling congestion. °

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5437  Respondent: 15397953 / Gillian Dobson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10726  Respondent: 15400769 / H L Cunnah  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

(3) Increased Traffic and Lack of Parking Facilities -
On the assumption that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a 3-mile radius of the Horsleys. The impact on local roads will be awful. The roads are already in a terrible state, continually crumbling due to the strain of existing traffic and poor drainage causing flooding. Parking at Horsley & Effingham Junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be untenable.

(4) Local Road Networks –
As mentioned above, the roads in the Horsleys struggle to cope with the volume of traffic that already exists. In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burmtcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burmtcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well.

(5) Pollution –
The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10600  Respondent: 15400865 / M J Cunnah  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
3) Increased Traffic and Lack of Parking Facilities -
On the assumption that every new house has at least 2 cars, this means potentially 6,000 more cars within a 3-mile radius of the Horsleys. The impact on local roads will be awful. The roads are already in a terrible state, continually crumbling due to the strain of existing traffic and poor drainage causing flooding. Parking at Horsley & Effingham Junction stations (which are already full), at the shops, at the medical centre and at the village hall will all be untenable.

4) Local Road Networks –
As mentioned above, the roads in the Horsleys struggle to cope with the volume of traffic that already exists. In respect of the proposals for development at Wisley Airfield and for an upgrade the current A3 junction at Burntcommon to a full 4-way junction, SCC traffic modelling anticipates increased use of Guileshall Lane, Hungry Hill Lane and Tithebarns Lane for traffic accessing the A3 at Burntcommon in order to travel to Guildford and beyond. The SCC report states that “consequently, it indicates that further thought may have to be given to managing traffic in this area as part of a transport assessment should the development be progressed”. It appears that the Plan is proposing a strategic site at Wisley Airfield without even knowing what improvements to the local road infrastructure will be required. If that is the case for Wisley Airfield, then it is inevitably true for the proposed developments in East and West Horsley as well.

5) Pollution –
The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5654</th>
<th>Respondent: 15405857 / Raymond Mackay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. POLICY I3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5683</th>
<th>Respondent: 15406017 / Eleanor Roberts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. POLICY I3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5714  Respondent: 15406529 / David I Allan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5970  Respondent: 15408513 / Brian Rawling  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

As a local resident, with a young family I am acutely concerned, with air quality and the levels of harmful motor transport emissions. Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” As this development, is within 400m from my house, I ask GBC to detail how they acheive this? This proposed development, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, and emissions in traffic will mount up waiting for the lights to change. This will be particularly acute to nearby properties such as mine. This will have a detrimental health effect to my children when they play in their garden.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/6011  Respondent: 15420833 / Marjorie Moss  Agent:

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns.

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6007  Respondent: 15421249 / Mike Hall  Agent:

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I despair at the lack of vision in exploring innovative solutions. Over 30 years of almost total inaction with the sole exception of P&R. There are so many things that could be done:

- integration of bus and rail services is essential

- rapid transport solutions of various kinds linking P&R, the centre, the main station, the hospital and research park etc, perhaps comprising an expanded train service with new stations plus trams or even buses running on raised tracks above the narrow main road arteries coupled with a dramatic reduction in public car parks (disabled only?) to ensure new public transport services are fully used and thereby have a chance of being economic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16827  Respondent: 15421249 / Mike Hall  Agent:

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I despair at the lack of vision in exploring innovative solutions. Over 30 years of almost total inaction with the sole exception of P&R. There are so many things that could be done:

- integration of bus and rail services is essential

- rapid transport solutions of various kinds linking P&R, the centre, the main station, the hospital and research park etc, perhaps comprising an expanded train service with new stations plus trams or even buses running on raised tracks above the narrow main road arteries coupled with a dramatic reduction in public car parks (disabled only?) to ensure new public transport services are fully used and thereby have a chance of being economic
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6048  **Respondent:** 15422145 / Orlando Lee  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16853  **Respondent:** 15422145 / Orlando Lee  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/6064  **Respondent:** 15422529 / David Roberts  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
north east of the borough will lead to further highways congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute as traffic spills onto roads in built up residential areas and will lead to greater levels of air pollution, which in turn will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6193  Respondent: 15426337 / C Cope  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6215  Respondent: 15426337 / C Cope  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The high level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6267  Respondent: 15427617 / Ken Scotland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the North East of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built-up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6276  Respondent: 15427745 / Barry Nelson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor is, frankly, laughable and could not possibly be delivered given the narrow roads and pinch points. If the SMC were implemented it would create general chaos with the immediate surrounds and make Burpham 'impossible'.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6292  Respondent: 15427969 / Chris Mealing  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6309  Respondent: 15428097 / Bridget McClellan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS. Policy 13
I OBJECT, as often the proposed sites are remote from existing bus stops, stations and even roads with pavements. This assumes that people will stop using cars as transport methods. This assumption is unrealistic as has been proved time and time again in new developments resulting in parking chaos around the developments as residents try and park near home and traffic snarl ups.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6328   Respondent: 15428225 / Vian Lee   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6366   Respondent: 15429985 / Jennifer Slade   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT that the already overloaded infrastructure and existing transport overload seems to have been completely ignored in the case of Send, as has the existing traffic congestion during peak times and in particular Send Barns Lane (A247) being used by large commercial vehicles, for which the road is totally unsuited. This is without the inevitable significant overload which will be caused by the proposed additional housing population and industrial development which is just not sustainable and will cause major traffic jams and significantly increased pollution for the existing population of Send. A Narrow Boat Marina and additional housing is already being developed in Tannery Lane, using a narrow road with a dangerous junction onto the A247 in the middle of Send Village. Send has already become a principal through route from Woking to the M25 and A3 and will become gridlocked all day - even without the proposed NEW 4-Way A3 Interchange. This alone could destroy the village and cause major Health and Safety problems, particularly in relation to the new development and merger of two schools which front onto Send Barns Lane (A247). There is already serious parking congestion and traffic problems with just the one current school. With the addition of the new second, congestion will increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6380   Respondent: 15430305 / Moira Griffin   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the lack of specific policy to ease an existing rural public transport crisis.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6398  Respondent: 15430753 / Nick Wright  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This plan provides too much land for development but not enough to ease congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6482  Respondent: 15433569 / Jennifer Beddoes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the disproportionate potential distribution of new houses across the Guildford Borough: the villages to the North East of Guildford are projected to take an unsustainable number of additional residents in a area where country lanes are narrow and the volume of traffic already using through routes already makes roads gridlocked during the rush hours. Your proposals do not show the effect on local roads - in particular the A247 and Potters Lane

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6525  Respondent: 15433825 / Mary Howard  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

More homes would lead to more traffic and even more congestion in the town centre.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6553  Respondent: 15434145 / Christine Townsend  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed number of new houses in an area where residents experience traffic congestion every single day, where I have to drive my husband to the station at Effingham Junction as there are no parking spaces for his car by the time he leaves after 9.30am, where it already takes two or three days before a doctor’s appointment is available in East Horsley, and the Waitrose car park in Cobham already has a daily queue for entry which blocks the approach road. Cobham, Ockham, the Horsleys and Ripley are already at capacity for the road and support infrastructure.

In the meantime if we choose to go to Guildford to support the Farmer’s Market the traffic getting in and out is painful. Last weekend I had to complete my weekend meat order by calling in at the butcher’s in Bramley. The A281 back to Guildford was solid so I went via Godalming and there was a roadworks diversion on the Charterhouse road. I sat in traffic for an hour trying to get home to Cobham. Compton was at a standstill. There are already too many people here!

I have lived in Ockham for 37 years and the quality of life has diminished here in that time along with the air quality due to the increase in traffic jams on the A3. Your local plan does not make life better for the residents who have been paying GBC Council Taxes for many years – we get less for more money.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6576  Respondent: 15434241 / Valerie Sowerby  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6575  Respondent: 15434273 / Brian Crosby  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The major developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and greater levels of air pollution, thereby having a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Burnt Common is already a very busy traffic crossroads and any new slip roads to new housing developments will feed more through and local traffic through a already congested area.

Our area, despite it being in or near Green Belt, is already grinding to a halt most of the day with traffic and the M25 which would bring people into the area does not function as a motorway any more with gridlock for 90% of the time and more traffic coming to the area will only add to the misery.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

My objection is on the grounds that traffic in the area (particularly along the A323) is already bad particularly in rush hour, and an increase by more than 2400 houses will only worsen this congestion.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Transport-

the following needs are unsupported in the plan:

Evidence of future traffic conditions which is in the SHAR has not been finished and has been provided too late for the PLAN to respond to.

The proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor is unsound, due to narrow roads and pinch points. At Burpham the London Road is supposed to carry 2 bus/cycle lanes north and south bound as well as 2 general traffic lanes each way. This will result in the Gosden Hill development, the 1000 car park and ride, 2 schools and railway station as well as unspecified retail and business traffic proposed to start as early as 2021 delivering massive traffic to London Road /new inn lane junction before the proposed A3 improvements in 2023-2027.
The tunnel, railway station etc issues need to be decided before the building of 2000 houses on the site where the 4 way junction of A3 is planned to go.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6664  Respondent: 15434913 / Margaret Amos  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The roads and other transport infrastructure required to support your proposals would create a completely unacceptable impact on the present highways, and together with other neighbouring plans for enormous developments, would cause catastrophic chaos to commuters and others in and out of Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6722  Respondent: 15437601 / Robert Legg  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object in the strongest terms to Guildford Borough Council’s Draft Local Plan June 2016.

I believe the Draft Local Plan is unsound and unsustainable due to lack of detail on basic infrastructure including the road network. Priority should be given to a solution being found and implemented to relieve the extensive existing traffic problems in and around the Guildford area especially the town centre and the A3 arterial route.

Until congestion relief is delivered on a sustainable basis it would be unsound to consider any major development in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6905  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to inclusion of the policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Ripley on the grounds of the harm it would do to the local environment in terms of air pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Travel - roads, buses and trains would be reduced to chaos if the proposed number of houses were to be granted

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Guildford is already a bottle neck on the A3 and the most logical solution is a tunnel such as that at Hindhead. It therefore follows that no new development should be allowed to take place until such a decision has been made so that land that will be needed for its construction is not used.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The village (West Horsley) does not have the infrastructure to sustain expansion to the degree that is suggested by the Guildford plan.

There is currently:
- One small village shop
- No post office
- No bank or cash machine
- No doctors surgery
- No secondary school
- Not enough state primary school places
- Limited bus service

Any development in West Horsley will therefore have a significant impact on the facilities (shops, doctors, station, parking) in East Horsley with is already stretched with the current size/population of the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6920  Respondent: 15440705 / Jane Martin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Current village roads are not big enough or well enough made to sustain an increase in traffic. Each new household will most likely bring with it 2-3 cars as a necessity in this rural area. In addition to the 4-5000 additional cars that will come with the proposed development at Wisley Airfield. The impact of this on local roads is massive. Traffic already travels at dangerous speed (well about the 30 mph limit) along Ockham Road North, The Street and East Lane. An increase in traffic on the local roads will increase the danger to residents of all ages including the very young and elderly. It will also lessen the semi-rural nature of the village.

Horsley Station is already a busy commuter station 7 days per week. With most travellers travelling to the station by car the car park/waiting area/volume of traffic at peak times (London commuting and school times) will be unsustainable for East Horsley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6947  Respondent: 15441025 / Angela Batterbury  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The infrastructures in this area are NOT ADEQUATE to withstand more families and their needs, more crowds and more traffic on our roads.

The roads are not even repaired to cope for the present level of traffic, East Lane for instance is a disgrace.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/6961</th>
<th>Respondent: 15441249 / Geoff Nicholson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the provision of a local railway station is not cost effective unless there is a fast train service to London. If a fast train service does take place then this will increase road traffic congestion and create parking issues in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7040</th>
<th>Respondent: 15442049 / Ellouise Fassom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7041</th>
<th>Respondent: 15442081 / Lauren Fassom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPP16/7091  Respondent: 15442561 / Tegan Meredith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the very large proposed development of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will wipe out large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land. It would also prove to be catastrophic to the surrounding small roads, which would not be able to cope, and on the A3 and M25 interchange nearby.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7142  Respondent: 15442913 / Inger Scotland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the North East of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built-up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7195  Respondent: 15445665 / Jonathan Hewlett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7) I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7197  Respondent: 15445665 / Jonathan Hewlett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted limits. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7233  Respondent: 15445793 / Jackie Withers  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7256  Respondent: 15446305 / Mo Adda  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
the amount of traffic that will generate on Burpham’s area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14381  Respondent: 15446401 / Louise Yandle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):

- Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
- Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
- Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. i.e. most residents!
- Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7273  Respondent: 15446625 / Robert Moseley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Roads:

The roads that will be used by the proposed houses simply will not cope with increased traffic. They barely cope with the traffic during morning and evening rush hours already. The staggered junction across Ockham Road North from the end of East Lane across to the Drift will simply be grid-locked and pose an ever greater danger to the children who cross that junction on their way to and from school.

At present the road surfaces are inadequately maintained and are riddled with pot-holes. The surface of East Lane near to the junction with Ockham Road is a disgrace. This problem can only get worse with an increase in traffic such as that proposed. As the budget for road maintenance seems to be inadequate to deal with present problems where are the necessary added resources to come from if these proposals are accepted? I therefore object to the proposals on these grounds

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7288  Respondent: 15446753 / David Boyce  Agent:
10. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7292  Respondent: 15447777 / Maggie Kalupka  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The traffic through Ripley currently, especially that going towards the A3 London bound, is already, at times extremely heavy, how the roads would cope with the extra local traffic created is hard to imagine.

With large developments at both Gosden Farm and Wisley Airfield adjacent roads would come to a complete standstill. Ripley has over the past two or three years seen many small pockets of housing developed, the proposed plan at The Talbot is over development in the conservation area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7344  Respondent: 15448193 / B. A. Howell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policies I2, I3: the proposed ThreeFarms Meadow and Garlick's Arch site will need considerable alterations for Trunk road access; who will pay for this? It seems that the question is just assumed away, it will happen to allow the developers to build. If that assumption is based on the ordinary tax payer funding road improvements, then it is high objectionable; why should any one allow tax payers money to subsidise private development profit when they object tp the whole Plan in the first place. Either way the situation on the A3 and M25 is one of total congestion at key times; the A£ is-congested between Guildford and Cobham, most all the time; how do the authorities think that thousands more vehicles are going to be accomodated?

With air quality breaking the limits set for healthy habitation, the polution levels, Nitrous oxide, Bezines etc, will undoubtedly rise to totally illegal standards. The situation in the north of the Borough is aledy extreme.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7353</th>
<th>Respondent: 15448289 / Paul Miller</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the road system in Burpham is inadequate to deal with the large volume of extra traffic that would be generated, and this will lead to congestion and increases in accidents at junctions and roundabouts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7411</th>
<th>Respondent: 15448321 / Nicole Mapplebeck</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7412</th>
<th>Respondent: 15448353 / Emily Roberts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
means of sustainable forms of transport from the above mentioned developments. Guildford residents use cars and these proposals only increase the likelihood of more cars on our roads.

Furthermore the Department for Transport’s Road Investment Strategy includes schemes for the A3 in Guildford and the M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange; Also, it says that interim ‘quick win’ schemes to deliver road safety and some congestion relief on the A3 in Guildford will be delivered within the plan period. But ‘some’ relief does not commit to assuring residents that any work will be undertaken in this area.

The SA states that the delivery of housing in the later stages of the plan period is dependent upon major improvement to the A3. When will we know about this and is the Guildford plan being held back until such information is confirmed? No statement is included to this effect.

The SA notes that another important consideration is the potential for increased traffic to impact on historic character within Conservation Areas; It states that it is difficult to draw strong conclusions in the absence of detailed modelling work. Should this not be a pre-cursor to any plan? An issue of particular importance it notes is that there is likely to be an increase in traffic through the Ripley Green and Ockham Conservation Areas (the former being associated with a high concentration of listed buildings)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7497  Respondent: 15449409 / Margaret Ashmore  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to any houses etc being built in and around Send, Send Marsh, Ripley, Ockham, and Burpham.

for each house built - think at least two cars, so a TOTAL of 6325 would equate to 12600 vehicles on our country roads, which are not made for such an increase in traffic, they are at Full capacity now.

I Object to the proposed new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, if there is an accident on the A3 where does the traffic go, through the villages. We already experience problems if the A3 or M25 are closed due to Accidents - where does the traffic go - through the villages.

When Newark Lane was closed for 6months for bridge work, all traffic was diverted through Send or Ripley to get anywhere - this caused long delays.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7517  Respondent: 15449857 / Fiona Cumberland  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7526</th>
<th>Respondent: 15449889 / Harriet Bell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7531</th>
<th>Respondent: 15449985 / Elizabeth Mead</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family have lived in Woodlands Close, Clandon Road for 32 years. Over this time it is very clear that traffic has increased significantly to such an extent that during peak periods residents of Woodlands joining the A 247. Residents and those living nearby can regularly take up to 10 minutes due to a solid line of traffic coming from Woking to join the A3 in a southerly direction .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7613</th>
<th>Respondent: 15450785 / Georgina Love</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3) The size of the development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to increased congestion and to greater levels of air pollution. This will have a detrimental impact on local residents health and I have particular concerns for the elderly and children in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPP16/7679  Respondent: 15451009 / Michael Love  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
The size of the development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to increased congestion and to greater levels of air pollution. This will have a detrimental impact on local residents health and I have particular concerns for the elderly and children (especially my own children) in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7689  Respondent: 15451041 / Iain Bell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C)

There is no schedule for Garlicks Arch (A43); the plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and therefore it is not fit for purpose

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7708  Respondent: 15451457 / Camilla Bell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7724  Respondent: 15451713 / Gaby Attwood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7780  Respondent: 15452193 / Susan Hibbert  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I appreciate that Guildford urgently needs a local plan in order to develop coherently and to prevent inappropriate (and in the case of the Solum application for the railway station, one could say 'disastrous') speculative development, but it has to be the right plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7834  Respondent: 15454625 / Paul Woy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Local air quality is known to be poor. This is principally due to the congestion on the SRN with both the A3 and M25 at a standstill during peak hours. Residents of the proposed development (5100) will rely on the private car as the local roads, which are narrow and windy and unlit are not suitable for cycling or walking, nor are they suitable to for public transport. An additional 4000 cars will make the local roads, which are already under pressure more congested as residents travel to work, school etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7872  Respondent: 15455233 / Andrew Hamilton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Local air quality is known to be poor. This is principally due to the congestion on the SRN with both the A3 and M25 at a standstill during peak hours. Residents of the proposed development (5100) will rely on the private car as the local roads, which are narrow and windy and unlit are not suitable for cycling or walking, nor are they suitable to for public transport. An additional 4000 cars will make the local roads, which are already under pressure more congested as residents travel to work, school etc.
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

a. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
b. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
c. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
d. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
e. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
f. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

At present it is extremely difficult to drive into Guildford from Burpham - the flow of traffic is just unbelievable. I note it has been indicated that an additional 2,000 homes hope to be built in Burpham. You have to consider that if this crazy plan is passed 2,000 homes could generate at least 4,000, possibly more, cars (2/3 cars per household is the ‘norm’ these days) so how will we be able to drive into the City centre and exactly where will all these additional cars be parked - if,
and when, they arrive in Guildford? You must be aware that parking in this present day is very difficult - on occasions impossible!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7975</th>
<th>Respondent: 15457441 / Margaret Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) I object to Increased traffic on already badly surfaced road and small lane so congestion.

10) I object since our villages have limited parking

11) I object to severe pollution in areas already severely affected

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7992</th>
<th>Respondent: 15457505 / Julie Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8901</th>
<th>Respondent: 15460353 / Elizabeth Hewlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17361</th>
<th>Respondent: 15460737 / Donna Collinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.24 The Sustainable Movement Corridor will provide a priority pathway

The impact on non-prioritised users and knock-on effects for surrounding roads need to be assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/2689</th>
<th>Respondent: 15460737 / Donna Collinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Policy ID3 Sustainable transport for new developments

The change from ‘will expect’ to ‘will be required’ in point (2) is supported. The similar revised wording in point (7) is also supported.

The lack of specificity about the Sustainable Movement Corridor makes it difficult to make an informed comment on point (3).

In para 4.6.28, the aim of achieving a modest modal shift is noted, and also that the road schemes in the plan will ‘mitigate the principal adverse material impacts of this growth in traffic volumes’. It is realistic to recognise that there will be congestion on the road network in peak periods. However, the problem is that better evidence is required of what conditions will be like both half way through the plan period and in 2034. The risk of them being unsatisfactory (perhaps unacceptable) is significant. Point (11) is noted but it is not clear that any of the town centre sites included in the plan would involve additional off-street car parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8126</th>
<th>Respondent: 15461601 / Nicholas Carter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure Policy I3
In order to try and save money I have recently decided to cycle to work rather than use the car. A one-way trip is 50 minutes, which, realistically is not to everyone’s taste. Other than the obvious health benefits, it means I am not sitting in commuting car jams every day as I can find alternative cycle routes often away from the main flow of traffic.

However it has made me realise that the proposed large housing developments at Wisley Airfield, the Horsleys and also further up the A3 in Send and on the edge of Burpham (Guildford) will make cycling on the local roads even more difficult and dangerous than it is already. Most of our local roads are narrow and windy, unlit and with poor sight lines. Many of them have pinch points which means larger buses and HGVs have to go over the centre white line or up onto the pavement. Cycling is for the brave on these roads and the large volume of additional traffic likely to come with the proposed developments will not convince people to take it up in preference to their car. The Wisley Airfield proposal is suggesting that cycling along narrow country lanes is to be encouraged to get to rail stations some 3 miles away. I think this is highly unlikely.

I OBJECT to Policy I3 as I feel it doesn’t consider accurately enough the consequences of excessive housing developments on our local roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8135  Respondent: 15461633 / Anna Wood  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8184  Respondent: 15462017 / Kevin Rhoades  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

As mentioned earlier the huge developments being proposed will lead to congestion and increasing levels of pollution. This would have a detrimental effect on local resident’s health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8199</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15462273 / Frank Smith</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My main issue with the plan is the impact on cars and traffic in the local area and the subsequent quality of roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8262</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15462785 / Thomas McMinn</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <strong>I OBJECT</strong> to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/720</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15464161 / Toby Marshall</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of the former Wisley airfield is clearly at odds with revised policy 1D3. It is simply not possible to offer a sustainable transport policy for a site which is positioned in this location in the middle of nowhere, with no local amenities, narrow country lanes, no lighting and no public transport facilities. I object to the inclusion of the former Wisley airfield within the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8358</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15464673 / Trudy Grey</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8402  Respondent: 15466113 / Tim Grey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object that housing on the Green Belt will increase traffic bringing increased danger and pollution and slower journey times on our already overcrowded village roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8414  Respondent: 15466113 / Tim Grey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. POLICY I3

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8449  Respondent: 15466177 / D.L. + E.J. Wilkinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):

- Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of
- Fails to treat sustainability as a Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
- Un Most people can't or won't walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. i.e. most residents!
- Town's eye view of Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it Ignores terrible state of Surrey's roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9816  Respondent: 15466209 / Janet Parry-Morris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Congestion on village roads and lanes

Many local villages suffer from long traffic delays and congestion. Junctions like Newark Road and Rose Lane in Ripley, and the Shell roundabout at Burnt Common often have long traffic queues, which are likely to be significantly worse should the local plan be implemented. I object to the further congestion in and around our villages the development would cause.

Congestion on local trunk roads

Local trunk roads such as the A3 and M25 already suffer severe congestion during the rush hour. I object to the development of sites in the vicinity of trunk roads where there are current issues with rush-hour congestion.

Parking issues in local villages

Parking in local villages such as Ripley is already an issue. It’s frequently impossible to find parking in the village for longer than two-hour periods. I object to the proposals as further development around our villages and an increased population would make parking even more difficult.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8464  Respondent: 15467905 / C J Reina  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The new homes and developments proposed on sites at Gosden Hill Farm, Blackwell Farm, Wisley, Slyfield etc, plus the destruction of village communities (currently situated in the Green Belt) will only add to the already overloaded access roads. Road traffic travelling towards the town centre and A3 southbound from Burpham is already being forced to divert
via the Weylea Farm estate to avoid congestion on the London Road through Burpham. Even London Road adjacent to Stoke Park and Guildford By-Pass are already congested and reaching saturation point - and this is before any further development has occurred.

Road users are already impatient and stressed by the infamous congestion on the M25, I believe that development on the site proposed will result in unacceptable chaos and traffic jams would inevitably lengthen and increase not only on the M25 but also the A3 in both directions. Any accidents occurring on both these major roads and on the access roads would be extremely difficult for emergency response vehicles to deal with.

I urge the Council to re-think both the size and the location of the proposed developments.

It will be too late once the houses are built. Thinking ahead concerning infrastructure is vital. Lessons must be learned from the disasters associated with the Aldi store development. Clearly the limited road access to and from the store was not taken in to account when Planning Permission was granted and this is a relatively small development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8476  **Respondent:** 15468065 / Robert Medhurst  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

At present Send consists of many narrow roads surrounded by many fields and wooded areas where people cycle, walk, run, bird watch and exercise dogs. The proposed developments would make these activities cease, because of the dangers from traffic which would increase dramatically with the proposed housing developments. We regularly see new development with inadequate parking, the only realistic expectation is two cars per household will be added to our local road system. Also we have seen lorry traffic has increased many times over the last two years and it would increase even more during the housing developments on roads that are already in a poor state of repair.

All of the proposed projects would have a dramatic effect on traffic levels and pollution on major roads such as the M25 and the A3 and then filtering down to the country lanes which cannot deal with the volume and potential danger of excessive traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8483  **Respondent:** 15468097 / Allan Hempstead  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)**

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Comment ID: PSLPP16/8490  Respondent: 15468161 / Jane Bell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8503  Respondent: 15468609 / Lesley Lane  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8534  Respondent: 15469249 / Daniel Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Transport

Having lived in Burpham for many years, the congestion has steadily got worse until the opening of Aldi and then it got substantially worse – this was after many traffic surveys carried out by GBC during the planning process and proves how unreliable and unrealistic the current method of surveying is.

A realistic traffic solution must be put in place before any agreement is made on housing.
London Road is currently queueing solidly from the Spectrum roundabout to the A3 northbound constantly between the hours of 3.30pm and 6.30pm adding a bus lane and a cycle lane to this will result in more chaos and undoubtedly more accidents as there is not sufficient space.

I look forward to hearing from you that the Council has come to it’s senses and will revisit and amend this unsound plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8688  Respondent: 15474849 / Timothy Yorath  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans.

This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8723  Respondent: 15475297 / Jane Patricia Chandler  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My son and grand children live on The Street in West Clandon, [personal information redacted], and I visit on a weekly basis and stay for two days to look after my grandchildren. The Street is already a extremely busy and dangerous road with a narrow pavement and in places the road so narrow that trucks and buses have to mount the pavement to pass. I regularly walk my grandchildren along The Street to the recreation ground which is an unpleasant and dangerous experience and it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident on this road. Furthermore the exit from my sons property is the completely blind bend opposite the church. Exiting the property onto the road is already extremely dangerous and the prospect of the increased traffic resulting from the proposals in the local plan will only make things worse. I therefore object to the Local Plan in its current form on following basis.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8734  Respondent: 15475297 / Jane Patricia Chandler  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8776</th>
<th>Respondent: 15476289 / Gregory Heffer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8791</th>
<th>Respondent: 15476641 / Tessa Hart</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8796</th>
<th>Respondent: 15476673 / Josh Hart</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6,000 additional cars will mean much higher levels of air pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
6,000 additional cars will mean much higher levels of air pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLP16/8821  Respondent: 15477569 / Paul Cheeseman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling for which there is no empirical or logical evidence provided.
2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes most with two cars.
3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham
4. The increase in the already severe congestion on the A3 and Ripley village.
5. The lack of suitable public transport. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads on the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
6. The absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
7. The A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

7) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. **Traffic and Roads**

The road sat present in Burpham are not sufficient to take the amount of traffic which will be generated by the new developments.

The proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor in the proposal of London Road will not take the amount of traffic required, even if the possible A3 tunnel is built.

The increase in traffic will not be able to be dealt with by the London Road/New Inn Lane roundabout.

Thus, again I object to the plan in regard to traffic movement in Burpham.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/8953  **Respondent:** 15478017 / Kirstie Pankhurst  **Agent:**  

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):

- Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
- Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
- Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. I.e. most residents!
- Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9009  **Respondent:** 15478177 / Michelle Brown  **Agent:**  

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the
north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15889  Respondent:  15478209 / Sally Daboo  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

The A247 in West Clandon is already used by too many vehicles travelling too quickly and any additional traffic could make it dangerous.

As an electric wheelchair user I often travel between my parents’ home [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998.] Guildford and Clandon station. The road is already too busy to cross safely, especially when cars are travelling above the speed limit as they often do. There is limited pavement on either side of the road and it is incredibly scary when large vehicles including lorries regularly mount the pavement at various “pinch points” along the road, or come extremely close to me when I am travelling on the pavement. There are no sensible places to cross the A247 between my parents’ house and either the train station or the bus stops, but as I am reliant on accessible public transport I have no choice but to put myself in danger in order to reach my destination. Even where you can see a little distance in either direction, this is insufficient with the volume of traffic using the road and the fact that it consistently approaches at speeds well above the limit. Any increase in the volume of traffic using the A247 (which would be the inevitable outcome were these plans to go ahead as currently described) would be extremely dangerous, not only for myself but for others using the pavements, especially those with disabilities, small children or pushchairs who require the full width of the pavement and can’t move out of the way quickly if vehicles come to close or even mount the pavement. The presence of many narrow points and a large density of twists and turns along the A247 make it difficult for drivers to see what is ahead and drive safely, especially when the speed limit is being exceeded. I believe that local peoples’ lives will be put at risk as a direct result of these plans being carried out as they stand and I fully expect the council to take this into consideration and not go ahead.

Similarly in peak times Guildford City Centre is already too busy and congested, and there is little possibility for mitigating this problem, or indeed consideration of this issue in the proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15900  Respondent:  15478209 / Sally Daboo  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9082  Respondent: 15478785 / Alicia Grainger  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy I3

I'm not convinced that the measures are related to real life or the particularities of Guildford. Most people don’t or can’t walk or cycle here – commuters are in a hurry, and people carrying heavy shopping or other goods i.e. most residents, wouldn’t use the transport suggested. It is a towns eye view of transport and ignores the scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. It ignores the terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. and the huge extra stress that would be created by new housing developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9155  Respondent: 15479681 / George Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9157  Respondent: 15479777 / Alexandra Trebilco  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan
I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9158</th>
<th>Respondent: 15479809 / James Trebilco</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9164</th>
<th>Respondent: 15479905 / K Dormer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9165</th>
<th>Respondent: 15479969 / W J Edwards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9166</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480033 / Tanya Wicks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9172</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480161 / D Crowcey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9176</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480225 / Andrew Vovterhalter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9177</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480289 / Jemima Vovterhalter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9178</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480417 / J Chequer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9179</td>
<td>Respondent: 15480449 / A D R Lewis</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9180</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480513 / Janet Graham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9181</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480545 / L Graham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPP16/9182   Respondent: 15480609 / R E Jones   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9185   Respondent: 15480641 / Gillian Battams   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9186   Respondent: 15480769 / Caroline Battams   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9187   Respondent: 15480833 / Stuart Wittke   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan

I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9200</th>
<th>Respondent: 15481025 / Marion Kincses</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9205</th>
<th>Respondent: 15481057 / P M Stephens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9210</th>
<th>Respondent: 15481089 / Ann Stone</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9221</th>
<th>Respondent: 15481217 / C R Avery</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to 2016 Draft Local Guildford Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to a totally unrealistic number of houses for the country lanes to absorb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9316  Respondent: 15481409 / Amy F Corstin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9509  Respondent: 15482817 / C.E. Pullen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9585  Respondent: 15483553 / Robert Bastable  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13) The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

** I object to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads A3/M25 (Policy 12) Both the A3 and M25 need improvements before any developments commence. This is clearly not going to happen in the timescales of the plan, so the proposed developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlicks Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25) should NOT take place. Please record these objections individually against the relevant sections of the plan and ensure that they are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Transport:

The evidence on future traffic conditions which has been provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report was produced late and is incomplete. Critical information on congestion has not been given in time to be taken into account in the plan proposals.

The proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor is simple unsound and cannot be delivered due to the narrow roads and pinch points on an already very congested route through Burpham.

Of further note is that the proposed Gosden Hill development of 2000 houses plus offices, school etc will add significant pressure to the already congested London road and New Inn Lane. The increase in solution and noise is unacceptable.

The phasing of the proposed Gosden Hill development is in advance of proposed improvements to the A3. This makes no sense.

The major transport issues around Guildford need to be resolved before any further development is considered, these include the proposed A3 tunnel, new river crossing, a workable central bus terminal and a rail station at Merrow.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9675  Respondent: 15485281 / Fiona Stobart  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9702  Respondent: 15485345 / Ruth Beavington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/9721  Respondent: 15485473 / Eilish Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
   The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9776  Respondent: 15485985 / Jean Dunning  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the strain put on the already strained infrastructure in these villages. Ripley high street is already crowded with cars, with little parking and the junction with Newark Lane is chaotic at peak times and many times during the day. Add many more homes to the mix and the route to/from the A3 would be strained to breaking point, not to mention liable to lead to accidents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9793  Respondent: 15486049 / Ceri Schooling  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Poor air quality concerns
I object as it will mean greater air pollution.

Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic
The local roads in the area are very narrow.

Congestion on the local village roads and lanes
I object as more traffic would mean terrible congestion for villages and lanes.

Congestion on the trunk roads, A3/M25
I object to the development of the strategic sites due to A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours, it would only make transport much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9915</th>
<th>Respondent: 15488033 / Bradley Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The London Road (one of the main roads into the town centre) does not have the capacity to include a bus lane and a cycle lane, furthermore, the current Bus system does not warrant the need for an extra lane. The designation as a sustainable movement corridor cannot be correct as the road is not wide enough and the traffic is already horrendous queuing the full length from The Parkway to the A3100 Clay Lane. The costs and disruption, in my view, clearly outweigh any benefits that might be gained, certainly, this won't encourage residents to drive less.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9951</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495041 / J D Clarkson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the impact of the increased traffic will be a disaster for local residents. The plan for the roads hinges on the provision of two new slip roads but these are not likely to be delivered until 2021 at the earliest and may be as late at 2033. Each slip road is likely to cost £10m. I strongly suggest that these will not be delivered and even if they are it will be long after the damage to the local environment has been done.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13819</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495361 / Therese Elizabeth Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) The amount of traffic in our area has reached saturation point, I leave home over an hour early to get to school for 8 30, grid locks are normal events and tempers are always running high.

2) I live on an approach road to the A3/M25 getting out of the drive is very dangerous, in fact I had a serious accident last year and I cannot leave my drive now unless a member of my family helps me. If any further developments happen around Ripley/Send the amount of traffic down Newark lane will increase even more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10013</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495649 / Stephen Cruse</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10115  Respondent: 15496513 / Paul Houghton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clay Lane link road

I object to the building of the clay lane link road from Slyfield to Clay Lane. I have previously provided detailed reasons why I object to this but briefly, Clay lane, Blanchards Hill and other local roads are already very busy and dangerous, particularly at rush hour. Blanchards Hill is a rural road with no footpath and would be particularly more dangerous if traffic was to increase. A lot of the houses along all roads are very close to the road and therefore resulting increase in heavy traffic would be detrimental to the buildings as well as causing disruption to the inhabitants. It would also ruin the nature of the area by making it a busy thoroughfare rather than a village where people live.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10209  Respondent: 15497505 / Jyoti Nanda  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10313  Respondent: 15500161 / Joanna Scott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and our health. Hold on a minute, I live here and I object!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10610  Respondent: 15502241 / Richard Atkinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns.

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10355  Respondent: 15502817 / Linda Margaret Cutbush  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10543  Respondent: 15504001 / Margaret Banks  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10617  Respondent: 15504193 / Carol Waghorn  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECTION TO PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN WEST HORSLEY

The proposals currently being considered for increasing the density of housing in this area must take account of the B2039 (Ockham Road North/Ockham Road South) which is the only road linking the A3 through to the A246 Guildford road. This road is incapable of supporting the amount of traffic the proposed new housing would generate. I would imagine the cost of building or widening a connecting road would make the development proposals financially unfeasible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10664  Respondent: 15504801 / M A Lawrence  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Traffic

The increase in traffic on East Lane, in particular, will be intolerable with the proposal of over 345 new households impacting on this road (potentially up to 750 more cars?). It is already congested during school times from Nightingale Avenue and Northcote Road. This will have a massive impact on our day-to-day lives.

2000 houses are being planned for Wisley Airfield. Many of these potential residents will be driving in and out of Horsley to use the station and shops. We simply DO NOT have the capacity for additional parking at Horsley Station and local shops. The Station car park is currently full every weekday as it is. It will become impossible to use the train as there is no alternative parking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and our health. Hold on a minute, I live here and I object!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

• I OBJECT to the impact on the infrastructure around the villages. The roads around Send and Ripley are already congested and cannot cope with the current needs. The Local Plan does not incorporate a detailed transport infrastructure strategy that would demonstrate how the road network would support the additional pressure on the roads and other amenities if the proposed development went ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

infrastructure. I object to the developments for new sites within the green belt, for example the garlick arch site. As the infrastructure in Ripley village in not adequate to accommodate such a large number of new residents. At rush hour times trying to get through Ripley is bad enough. With queues backing up to the m25 in the evenings. Trying to join the a3 or come off the a3 will become far harder if there is so many new homes being built.

The parking is currently lacking in Ripley as already a small village and high street. With 400 new houses proposed at the garlick arch site, there could be potentially 800+ cars. As most households would have two vehicles. The local areas can not cater for this influx of vehicles. There is not enough parking in Ripley and send for this.
## What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

### Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10855</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506785 / Maverick Hornblow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to increased traffic that would be cause in which a village such as Ripley already cannot sustain its current demand without long tailback dangerous size vehicals manoeuvring in roads that has little or no pedestrian path way due to increased traffic lack of parking in the village for the present day users let alone if more were to be housed</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10860</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506817 / Reno Hornblow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased traffic that would be cause in which a village such as Ripley already cannot sustain its current demand without long tailback dangerous size vehicals manoeuvring in roads that has little or no pedestrian path way due to increased traffic lack of parking in the village for the present day users let alone if more were to be housed</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/10936</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507553 / David Lawton Garner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3) The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY I3 - Sustainable Transport for New Developments

I OBJECT. This is just a pie in the sky bit of box ticking, if one assumes that households have a minimum of one car but looking around it seems that most have two or more and this will be the normal means of transport. These days people will not wait around for a bus that fails to turn up, we will certainly not have a service like central London with one every 5 minutes, so if one is missing it is not too long to wait for the next. Unless Guildford borough bans the ownership of cars, cars will be the standard method of transport. People will not want to cycle because of the large number of cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11090</th>
<th>Respondent: 15509057 / Richard Golding</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy I3 - Sustainable Transport for New Developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Policy I3 - Sustainable Transport for New Developments

I strongly object to any development being built that does not have existing sustainable transport. Blackwell Farm, Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Garlicks Arch do not have such facilities. The former Wisley Airfield is absolutely isolated and can only be accessed by car and even if a bus service is provided, few will carry shopping, etc., by bus. Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill are in the same situation and none are accessible by foot. New developments should take place alongside existing sustainable transport facilities. The Merrow Golf Club, proposed for housing, is adjacent to a Park and Ride, that is an example of sustainable transport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11294</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570145 / Owen Eszeki</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy I3 - Sustainable Transport for New Developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Policy I3 - Sustainable Transport for New Developments

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11289</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570209 / Emily Cross</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy I3 - Sustainable Transport for New Developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I strongly object to any development being built that does not have existing sustainable transport. Blackwell Farm, Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Garlicks Arch do not have such facilities. The former Wisley Airfield is absolutely isolated and can only be accessed by car and even if a bus service is provided, few will carry shopping, etc., by bus. Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill are in the same situation and none are accessible by foot. New developments should take place alongside existing sustainable transport facilities. The Merrow Golf Club, proposed for housing, is adjacent to a Park and Ride, that is an example of sustainable transport.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11267</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570273 / Barnaby Geib</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11297</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570305 / Richard Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11341</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570817 / Tom Edelsten</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re: Responses to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)
I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to the Plan.

I frequently visit my daughter and son-in-law who live off The Street. Every week this entails many trips to neighbouring villages with small children in the car. The current density of road traffic along The Street makes joining and leaving it on a blind corner a hazardous action; it’s feels as though it’s only a matter of time when, not if, there will be an accident. The children’s ages are 2 and 4; we are confronted with lorries, high-speed bikes and hastening commuters on a daily basis. The only time it feels safe to join the road is when there is one of the rush hour jams.

This is the present situation in a rural village. The consequences of a huge boost in the local population doesn’t bear thinking about.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15325  Respondent: 15570817 / Tom Edelsten  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15356  Respondent: 15570817 / Tom Edelsten  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objections to specific policies and matters within the Plan.

There is already considerable concern in the village because of the narrow road running through it. At the particular point where we are, opposite the Church, there is already a bottleneck which it is impossible to change – listed buildings of historic interest etc. At several points in the village, there are tight corners, which cannot be changed because of constriction by buildings, walled gardens, listed features etc. This isn’t even the narrowest point.

I am by now very familiar with the road through the village and am already concerned about how much traffic “cuts through”; given the lack of facility for expansion, this can only become worse. The plan would seem to be complete madness.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11387  Respondent: 15571169 / Pamela Bevington  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The question of air-quality around the A3 has also been totally ignored. The existing situation in that the area around Wisley Airfield already breaks the maximum levels of pollution allowed by UK environmental laws. Adding the proposed numbers of houses on the airfield, plus the unrealistic increase in housing proposed for the Horsleys, will make this situation not only much worse, but exceedingly dangerous to many residents of supposedly rural country villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15323  Respondent: 15571201 / Zoe Dudgeon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11466  Respondent: 15571425 / Monika Neczaj  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):

• Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
• Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
• Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. I.e. most residents!
• Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11493</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15571553 / Darren Carbine</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY I3 - Sustainable transport for new developments - I OBJECT</strong></td>
<td>The policy fails in its primary task of guiding planning decisions. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths (see attached photos again). The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. The addition of two new stations will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11502</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object</strong> to the dominance of the A3 corridor</td>
<td>There appears to be a disproportionate amount of development proposed along the A3 in the north east of the Borough - large housing at Gosden Hill, Garlick's Arch and Wisley Airfield amongst others. These areas will effectively be providing dormitory accommodation either for Guildford or London. Residents in these areas would be relying almost exclusively for daily access and travel along the already over-congested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object strongly</strong> that in all these cases the developments proposed in green belt will dwarf the nearby villages, totally changing the key attributes of the Green belt was established to prevent urban sprawl with a clear policy that changes to the green belt should only be allowed in exceptional It is well established that the wish to build houses is not accepted as an exceptional circumstance. The fact that such building is being proposed on several places in the Borough clearly demonstrates that this is being viewed as a normal practice rather than as an exceptional circumstance. Such wholesale annexation of green belt is clearly against the wishes of the majority of the local population, is counter to stated government policy and is counter to the NPPF, if not in itself actually unlawful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the proposed resulting poor air quality - Policy

Paragraph 6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.”

The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to considerable further congestion and greater levels of air pollution. This will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

- I object to the dominance of the A3 corridor
  1. There appears to be a disproportionate amount of development proposed along the A3 in the north east of the Borough - large housing at Gosden Hill, Garlick's Arch and Wisley Airfield amongst others.
  2. These areas will effectively be providing dormitory accommodation either for Guildford or London. Residents in these areas would be relying almost exclusively for daily access and travel along the already over-congested A3.
  3. I object strongly that in all these cases the developments proposed in green belt will dwarf the nearby villages, totally changing the key attributes of the green belt.
  4. Green belt was established to prevent urban sprawl with a clear policy that changes to the green belt should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances. The fact that such building is being proposed on several places in the Borough clearly demonstrates that this is being viewed as a normal practice rather than as an exceptional circumstance. Such wholesale annexation of green belt is clearly against the wishes of the majority of the local population, is counter to stated government policy and is counter to the NPPF, if not in itself actually unlawful.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11513  Respondent: 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the proposed resulting poor air quality - Policy

- Paragraph 6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.”
• The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to considerable further congestion and greater levels of air pollution. This will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11522  Respondent: 15571681 / Anne Martin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11589  Respondent: 15571937 / S Bennell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11677  Respondent: 15573953 / Barbara Forrest  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to OBJECT to Amended planning application 15/P/00012 for the following reasons:

Sustainability: The site is remote and occupants will rely on the use of the private motor car adding to traffic congestion on both the Strategic Route Network (the A3 and the M25) and local roads which are already running over capacity.
• The application relies on people switching to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic as it is two miles to the nearest railway station and at least half the route has no footpath. Roads are narrow and unlit and hazardous due to surface water seeping from fields and ice and snow in winter. GBC has failed consistently to remedy the issues of Ockham Road flooding, simply placing the onus on the motorist with signage urging them to Beware. The very fact that signs are placed shows GBC has been alerted to a problem yet failed to remedy it, placing lives at risk. This will be exacerbated with a higher population density.
  • There is no spare parking capacity at either of the local stations.
  • Local villages have been disfigured by gallons of yellow paint to prevent parking- yet another indication of over-capacity of use and yet the basic issue has not been addressed- more parking is needed but there is no space for it. Adding more people will only make things worse.
  • Sites of this size are required to provide outdoor open space. The applicant has “double counted” the outdoor space with that required for SANGS
  • The loss of high quality agricultural land is in contravention of policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11866</th>
<th>Respondent: 15575457 / Pauline Johnson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The judicious and forward-thinking approach to housing development in Guildford would be to assess the existing road and traffic problems first, which would also include addressing the congestion and safety issues of the A3. Whether the answer is a tunnel, widening, double-deck or a by-pass to the by-pass, it would have to be very audacious and bullish planners and councillors who would willingly sign their name and stand up to say publicly that they approve of this current Plan. It would be their names connected with consigning Guildford to a future of traffic congestion, regular gridlock, and increased pollution.

I3 Until the GBC Local Plan has concrete solutions to the current traffic problems, experienced on the main arterial roads into Guildford, and addresses - justifiably and effectively - the increased pressure on the road infrastructure placed by new housing estates and new villages, any large-scale housing developments are inevitably in jeopardy. The new GBC Local Plan has not scored positively on its own 7-point On-line Questionnaire for the proposed sites, and that is the basis of my strong objection the Plan in its current form.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11975</th>
<th>Respondent: 15578465 / Jan Ellis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Allowing Green Belt development to pay for transport schemes will simply generate yet more traffic from more homes, fuelling congestion. I travel in from Gomshall every day and there is already a considerable backing up of traffic entering Guildford via the Epsom Road. This would be horrendous if the proposed level of new house building was to go ahead. Bus and train services from outlying villages are virtually useless as there are not enough of them and not often enough. I would be more inclined to use public transport if the buses and trains came more frequently than every 1 or 2 hours....
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12001  Respondent: 15578753 / Andrew Needham  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The transport evidence is very weak and major transport issues are unresolved e.g. another river crossing in the town, a central bus depot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12019  Respondent: 15578977 / Norman Evans  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The addition of nearly 14,000 extra homes and 25,000 to 30,000 people has very serious implications for infrastructure and traffic, which the Plan hardly addresses and for which there is little funding (if any) - schools, medical centres, drainage, sewerage and so on, but particularly roads. The impact of Brexit is yet to be fully felt, but will almost certainly limit public funding even further and developers will be reluctant to commit to new developments in an uncertain market. If the Plan is implemented, it will lead to an increase of around 25,000 to 30,000 vehicles, plus extra traffic generated by developments in other boroughs and by normal traffic growth. The borough’s roads are already overcrowded at particular times and many are in a state of poor repair. Moreover, away from the main arteries, the back roads are often little more than lanes - narrow and with no pavements. For them to safely accommodate all the extra traffic, there would need to be many road changes and adjustments, requiring more road furniture, pedestrian crossings, traffic controls and so on, all having a detrimental impact on the character and nature of our environment, aside from costing a huge amount.

The borough’s main artery, the A3, suffers considerable congestion now, particularly on the southern approach to the town’s turn-off, southwards at the hospital exit, and northwards at the junction with the M25, where pollution levels often exceed permitted levels. The Plan proposes more access to and from the A3 with a four-way junction at Burnt Common and further access at the Wisley junction (see item 6) to accommodate traffic from proposed new developments. These will only increase the number of vehicles using the road, adding excessive traffic levels, increased congestion and pollution. (There has been talk of building an A3 tunnel under Guildford, but this is a pipedream with no realistic prospect of ever being built, especially because of the huge cost, for which there is no planned funding).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12016  Respondent: 15579009 / Patricia Lines  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re: Primary Vehicular Access via Existing or Realigned Junction of A31 and Down Place access road, to be signalised

As a Hogs Back resident, I have received your notice drawing attention to these plans and wish to record that I object to these plans.

Whilst I appreciate the need for building new homes, it isn’t the actual development which is of concern but the seeming lack of proper and informed consideration to the infrastructure to support the development.

To try to install ANY form of access up to the A31 is only adding to the existing problems currently experienced along the Hogs Back stretch of the A31 and will have repercussion on all the surrounding villages, not only to the north side but also to the south side, including Puttenham and Compton.

To add to the existing weight of traffic on this section of road will force drivers to look to alternative routes into Guildford, with the consequence that the routes through the villages will also become deadlocked and dangerous.

This should not just be about the convenience of the new home owners/tenants to be installed in the new development, allowing them quick access to the A31, but also about the existing residents of the surrounding villages.

Sufficient provision should be made to the north, west and east of the development to move the additional weight of vehicles AWAY from this already congested area.

The effects on the existing residents and indeed the natural environment could be immense and presumably irreversible. The Hogs Back stretch of the A31 already suffers from numerous problems which the Council seems intent on ignoring at every turn, despite the residents’ efforts to be heard and not railroaded.

I have noticed there have been environmental study boxes installed along the Hogs Back – please could you advise who has installed them as I would be extremely interested to hear more about their findings.

If you can give me any direction in this matter, I will gladly take up my own further research.

In the meantime, I again reiterate MY OBJECTION to this access route.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12026  Respondent: 15579105 / Lucy du Preez  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extra housing proposed on the basis of transport limitations

Commuting from Horsley and Effingham Junction stations, where the parking is already full, would become unmanageable. The local road network is not sufficiently developed to cope with the huge number of extra cars that would be inevitable with this increase in housing - quite apart from the extra noise and air pollution to local residents, there is a real risk of bottle necks being created at junctions on and off the A3

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
| Comment ID: PSLPP16/12036 | Respondent: 15579137 / Nicodemus Brian Rhyner | Agent: |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13) |
| The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health. |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| **Attached documents:** |

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/12060 | Respondent: 15579361 / Caroline May | Agent: |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death. |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| **Attached documents:** |

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/12111 | Respondent: 15579649 / Peter E May | Agent: |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| 12. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13) |
| Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death. |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| **Attached documents:** |

| Comment ID: PSLPP16/12126 | Respondent: 15579969 / Candice Carrington | Agent: |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan proposed on the Guildford Borough Council. Although the videos and documents state that the plan is aimed at providing affordable housing to accommodate local workers and attract more talent to the area, there is insufficient detail provided as to how the infrastructure will be upgraded to cope with this increase.

It hardly needs to be said that traffic in Guildford and the surrounding roads, especially the A3, is cripplingly high. There are frequent accidents, some fatal, and even without an accident the high amount of traffic makes the commute very frustrating. The impact of going through this daily commute is very taxing on the well-being of people living in these parts. More homes in these areas increases the numbers of people, but the plan provides no details or suggestions such as widening of roads, provision of subsidised transport for locals or anything that will really reduce congestion on the roads and improve efficiency and personal well-being.

In addition, the impact on leisure such as walking and cycling is very, very dangerous. This area is very close to the popular South Downs and has lovely Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, but it is difficult to enjoy them safely as there are more and more large vehicles on the regular roads and taking to the back lanes to avoid traffic. This causes a conflict with those indulging in walking and cycling to enjoy the natural beauty. In fact, I personally know of a couple of people who have been knocked off their bicycles by close proximity to motorised vehicles. Your plan does not provide any clear information as to how this will be improved. There are general statements made about needing to accommodate other forms of transport, but there are no practical details given that will make these pursuits safer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12348  Respondent: 15582593 / Dermot McMullan  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12413  Respondent: 15583169 / Poul Jensen  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12465  Respondent: 15583585 / Josephine Rooke  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12464  Respondent: 15583617 / Deborah Gillam  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12493  Respondent: 15583777 / Adam Lee  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the congestion that development will cause and the lack of road infrastructure

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12502  Respondent: 15583809 / Nigel Stephenson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)
   The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. This would be terrible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12527</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584001 / Lorna Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)</td>
<td>The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12552</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584097 / George Gervasio</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I object to the congestion that the development will cause to local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure in the Local Plan. The local roads in the centre of Ripley and Send are completely overloaded as it is. The proposed development will cause even greater congestion and this Plan does not provide provision for improving the roads. Side roads are single or narrow track, poor quality with no pavements so are not suitable for increased traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12565</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584161 / Alexandra Elson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12595</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584481 / Jeremy Hamilton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12623  Respondent: 15584641 / Miriam Gilkerson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12646  Respondent: 15584833 / Maria Fort  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12661  Respondent: 15584961 / Helen Meredith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. POLICY I3

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion. This will lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12696  Respondent: 15585249 / Joe Eke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I OBJECT to the impact on the infrastructure around the villages. The roads around Send and Ripley are already congested and cannot cope with the current needs. The Local Plan does not incorporate a detailed transport infrastructure strategy that would demonstrate how the road network would support the additional pressure on the roads and other amenities if the proposed development went ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12731  Respondent: 15585441 / Laurie Will  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12785  Respondent: 15585665 / Sophie Thompson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/12958  Respondent: 15586017 / C Maslin  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**POLICY I3 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT**

I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments.

This is another aspirational policy, not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general ‘modal shift’ from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

I like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented. I.e. Cost of housing will increase.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12872  Respondent: 15587073 / Mark Sweeting  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. Traffic will increase significantly and the access and exit roads to and from the A3 are too narrow to cope with the resultant increase in traffic - particularly at peak hours.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12898  Respondent: 15587105 / John Downes  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12910  Respondent: 15587137 / John Oliver  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3

‘Sustainable Movement Corridor’ – it is impossible to see how this will work. Physically, in Burpham it would involve a significant widening of the road which would totally destroy the character of Burpham’s ‘Main St’. It is also difficult to see how this would affect behaviour given that most people would be afraid to use it, given the traffic volumes, and any would simply be incapable of using it. There are a lot of older people in Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12992  Respondent: 15587233 / Jane Clark  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13025  Respondent: 15587361 / Aileen Creegan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. TRAFFIC/ROADS/NOISE

Traffic congestion in Guildford is already chronic, and its impacts felt in many ways. In my area

1. Traffic noise from the A3 can be heard all over Burpham and into some of the estates in Merrow
2. Local access roads into and out of Guildford are badly congested in AM and PM rush hours, with the A3 backed up from Stag Hill to the Burpham turning on a very frequent basis.
3. The ever increasing amount of traffic on the A3 is making the already inadequate joining points with the A31 and hospital/university northbound, and town north and south bound, positively dangerous. (Have GBC recently looked at serious accident data and costs, and impact on emergency response rates for ambulances and fire services,.....)
4. Local planning approval of the Aldi Burpham store has led to traffic backed up Burpham Lane waiting for car park spaces, onto the roundabout with the London Road. This is happening ESPECIALLY AT WEEKENDS, the one time of the week that the London Road used to be relatively free flowing at this point.

Before any significant housing development takes place in the North of the Borough, the above problems need to be solved. If not, the chronic daily congestion will turn to grid lock.

I believe the answer to all of this is for GBC to think boldly, and FAST TRACK the A3 tunnel suggested, leaving the original A3 for local traffic. Benefits would be numerous, with POSITIVE outcomes for a big proportion of borough residents, businesses, and passing goods traffic.

- Reduction in loss of life and of serious injury impacts by improving safety for this stretch of the A3
- A3 Traffic noise elimination from Ripley through to Burpham, the town and cathedral/university campuses
- Local and trunk road significant congestion reduction and thus time and money savings for residents and business
- Pollution containment

This is GBC's chance to do something that the vast majority of residents would welcome, AND BENEFIT from. If a 2 km tunnel can be justified for Hindhead (population 4000, thus 0.5 tunnel metres per resident), let's secure the 8KM tunnel for Guildford (population 137 000, thus only 0.058 tunnel metres per resident).

A comment too on phasing - optimize and build the A3 tunnel first, don't reduce your flexibility and increase your tunnel cost by premature commitment to large scale housing developments at various points along the way.

The impact of the tunnel would then allow a more sensible debate on borough housing increase with the right infrastructure backbone already in place.

A word too on the suggested road developments within the draft plan. With respect to the north of the Borough and in the light of the massive housing proposals from Wisley through to Gosden Hill, these road developments alone, will be ineffective. They will simply deliver more traffic onto a full A3, and locally a full New Inn Lane/London Road. Congestion will worsen yet further, perhaps leading to frequent gridlock.

Furthermore, the suggested new Sustainable movement corridor in the London Road area will be anything but sustainable - adding to local traffic noise and pollution, and road safety impacts especially with respect to pedestrians and school children. Additionally how will this be built without compulsory purchase of local housing and business properties (Aldi????). I understand to that the roads part of the plan is "aspirational" only. How can this be acceptable, against a housing increase proposal of 25% over 20 years. THIS WILL JUST NOT WORK.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016) / further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13292</th>
<th>Respondent: 15589665 / Anna Worsley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13320</th>
<th>Respondent: 15589889 / Keith Macdonald</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to considerable further congestion despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13363</th>
<th>Respondent: 15590241 / Claire Tallis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attended documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13389</th>
<th>Respondent: 15590273 / Eunja Madge</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY I3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13472</th>
<th>Respondent: 15590593 / Johnathan Page</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13480</th>
<th>Respondent: 15590881 / David Godden</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSPORT - the following needs are unsupported in the plan:

Evidence of future traffic conditions which is in the SHAR has not been finished and has been provided too late for the PLAN to respond to.

The proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor is unsound, due to narrow roads and pinch points. At Burpham the London Road is supposed to carry 2 bus/cycle lanes north and south bound as well as 2 general traffic lanes each way. This will result in the Gosden Hill development, the 1000 car park and ride, 2 schools and railway station as well as unspecified retail and business traffic proposed to start as early as 2021 delivering massive traffic to London Road /New Inn Lane junction before the proposed A3 improvements in 2023- 2027.

The tunnel, railway station etc issues need to be decided before the building of 2000 houses on the site where the 4-way junction of A3 is planned to go.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13583  Respondent: 15593633 / Ila-Maria Patermann  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are also worried about the increased number of traffic resulting form this creating more air polution, which will particularly affect children and people with allergies.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13636  Respondent: 15593729 / Martin Warwick  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13634  Respondent: 15593761 / Celestyn Kwapisiewicz  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13731  Respondent: 15594817 / Toni Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13765  Respondent: 15595489 / Michael Crates  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4. I object to any further air and noise pollution caused by increased traffic

5. I object to the increased risk of accidents and deaths involving cyclists caused by increased traffic

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13770  Respondent: 15595489 / Michael Crates  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

17. I object to Lack of proper cycle lanes on local roads

18. I object to lack of proper pedestrian footpaths on local roads
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13806  Respondent: 15595681 / Willemien Downes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13818  Respondent: 15596225 / Thomas Patrick O'Shaughnessy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The introduction of such a disproportionate volume of new housing without first tackling the already severe traffic problems in the area is totally irresponsible and seriously questionable. Building housing and commercial developments which will inordinately increase the amount of traffic both residing within the area and travelling to Guildford from outside, will create a pressure cooker situation of constantly grid locked roads. The road system is currently under significant pressure and the problems of traffic management must be addressed before any new building in the area can be considered feasible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13904  Respondent: 15598113 / David J. Blackbourn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure Policies: The infrastructure policies are sensible. Policy I3 “Sustainable transport for new developments” and Policy I4 “Green and blue infrastructure” are important and I support each of them. Blackwell distinguishes itself in each of these areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/13917  Respondent: 15598241 / Madeleine Hewish  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13969  Respondent: 15598721 / Trevor Ottaway  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13978  Respondent: 15598817 / Paul Quy  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to poor Air Quality concerns - (Policy I3)

These huge developments that are being planned particularly here in the NE of the borough will clearly add to the current traffic congestion and further contribute to greater levels of pollution which are bound to have a detrimental effect on local residents and the health of their families.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13996  Respondent: 15599105 / Ryan McQuade  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the proposed Guildford plan 2016. Listed are my reasons why.
The first reason is that if the proposed number of houses is built, the traffic and danger to me walking around Horsley is heavily increased due to the traffic and number of cars on the road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14062  Respondent: 15601057 / Chris Vinall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14099  Respondent: 15601121 / Elspeth Anderson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14159  Respondent: 15601185 / Jane Young  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)
Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14158  Respondent: 15601217 / Patrick Barrass  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14156  Respondent: 15601249 / Ann Barrass  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14204  Respondent: 15601473 / Joseph Fort  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14276   Respondent: 15601953 / Stephen Yandle   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
- Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
- Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. I.e. most residents!
- Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14350   Respondent: 15602177 / Julia Hunt   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments This is another aspirational policy, not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport. The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths. The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK. The vast majority of the
borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times. Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town. I like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services. The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented. Ie. Cost of housing will increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14405</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602561 / Jonathan Clark</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14423</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602625 / Margaret Lambert</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14430</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602817 / Paul Douek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of proposed housing will damage local communities especially Ripley, Send and Clandon and is not sustainable due to lack of infrastructure. There are no rail stations near the proposed developments and no plans to improve the local roads. What about primary schools, doctors and dentists? Where are the thousands of extra cars going to go with no possibility of significant improvements to local roads?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16481</th>
<th>Respondent: 15603297 / Rony Douek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13). The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health. Already the air quality is already affected by the vicinity of the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14513  Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT): • Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford. • Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development. • Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. i.e. most residents! • Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16285  Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT): • Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford. • Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development. • Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. i.e. most residents! • Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14551  Respondent: 15603489 / Simon Pitt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Roads and Transport Infrastructure

- The rail station car park is normally full on weekdays. If the village population were to increase there will be added pressure on this already full parking scenario, and on traffic movements to/from Horsley station to drop off/collect travellers, commutators and school children.

- Traffic generated from the proposed new development will be significant, given most households in rural areas have 2 and often more cars. Journey times will increase significantly on local roads. The roads, by the way are already in a shocking state in terms of potholes.

- Increased traffic will also pose a safety issue to pedestrians. In some places the pavements are already very narrow and an increase in traffic increases the likelihood of an accident in these areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Policy i3 - Sustainable Transport for new developments

- The proposed policy is unrealistic and lacking clarity or credibility in its wording regarding developers proposing and securing travel plans for their developments and contributing to transport arrangements for both the able and disabled.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14565  Respondent: 15603521 / Nicholas Bullman  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14618  Respondent: 15603905 / Michael Douek  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</th>
<th>Attached documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPP16/14667</td>
<td>15604289 / Lesley Pitt</td>
<td>15604289</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPP16/14724</td>
<td>15606561 / Rebecca Warwick</td>
<td>15606561</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPP16/14725</td>
<td>15606593 / James Green</td>
<td>15606593</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>**I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14726  **Respondent:** Rebecca Sear-George  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14727  **Respondent:** Kim Hopwood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14799  **Respondent:** Louise Quy  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** These huge developments that are being planned particularly here in the NE of the borough will clearly add to the current traffic congestion and further contribute to greater levels of pollution which are bound to have a detrimental effect on local residents and the health of their families.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. I object the the development of the strategic sites at Wisley Airfield, Garlicks arch and Gosden Hill as the the road infrastructure does not have capacity to cope with any medium let alone large developments of the proposed scale.
2. I object to the inclusion of the Wisley airfield site and Garlicks Arch as strategic sites due to the congestion on local roads at all times of day. For instance it is often hard to pull out of my home onto the main road in Ripley due to a continual flow of traffic, adding more residents to the local area will result in a large increase in the number of accidents, especially as the roads are narrow.
3. I object to the Strategic sites as the road network that currently exists is barely maintained by the council, an increase in the traffic and number of HGVs using the roads will result in further deterioration. The road infrastructure is incapable of handling the increase demand during the construction phase without significant investment and will be in an even greater state of disrepair once an extra circa 2000 cars are using them daily. I object to the inclusion of Wisley airfield and Garlicks Arch in the local plan due to them being in unsustainable locations regarding public transport. Neither location has a suitable train station located within realistic walking or cycling distance, this means only bus services and cars are feasible.

I object the the inclusion of the large strategic sites as insufficient parking will be provided, the village of Ripley already has problems with residents parking on pavements, there is not enough space to support additional vehicles which would be here. Additionally the parking at local stations is insufficient, a multistory car park would need building at each station to accommodate even one of the smaller proposed strategic sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14837  Respondent: 15607937 / Joanna Kaminska-Hine  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed strategic sites as I fail to see how these are in any way helpful to the needs of local residents, if you also fail to provide improvements to the transport network, and rail access for the many new commuters who will move to the area there are no benefits to existing residents that you represent. There is a level of assumption being applied by the developer that the employment market is able to absorb the increase in residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14868  Respondent: 15608225 / Louise Wickham  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14877  Respondent: 15608289 / Olivia Marshall  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Currently the road network serving Burpham (primarily London Road, New Inn Lane and Clay Lane) is stretched beyond capacity on a daily basis and is made far worse if there are problems on the A3, which happens regularly. The proposed construction of new A3 southbound on and off slip roads and minor alterations to London Road will only have the effect of funnelling even more traffic through Burpham. At present there is often gridlock at the roundabouts connecting London Road to New Inn Lane and Clay Lane: a potential increase of 3000+ vehicles passing through the area as a result of the Gosden Hill development would exacerbate this problem and make it fairly consistent throughout the day, not just at rush hours. Although some of this extra traffic would join the A3 southbound, this would only stretch the congestion further north when even now at peak times, the southbound queue tails back from the beginning of the elevated section to the Burpham off-slip. It also to be noted that such an increase in traffic doesn’t just affect Clandon, Merrow and Burpham, it would have a corresponding effect on town centre traffic flow, congestion and parking.

Before embarking on further housing developments in Guildford, it is vital that the existing road and traffic problems are addressed first, which would also include addressing the congestion and safety issues of the A3. Those who agree to the plan would condemn Guildford to a future of increasing traffic congestion, regular gridlock, and increased pollution. The lack of practical detail regarding important infrastructures, such as roads, traffic flow and increased sewerage and water provision, indicates that the plan has not been positively prepared, and as such is not justified and consequently cannot be effective; it therefore does not meet GBC’s own overall aspirations and thereby fails the Duty to Cooperate.

Until the GBC Local Plan has concrete solutions to the current traffic problems, experienced on the main arterial roads into Guildford, and effectively addresses the increased pressure on the road infrastructure placed by new housing estates and new villages, any large-scale housing developments are inevitably in jeopardy. The new GBC Local Plan has not scored positively on its own 7-point On-line Questionnaire for the proposed sites, and that is the basis of my strong objection to the Plan in its current form.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15070  **Respondent:** 15610081 / Sarah Kelly  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15098  **Respondent:** 15610305 / Lesley Falknor  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
I understand that Guildford are trying to provide more homes for younger people in the area and whilst this is a good and needed plan, I have to object due to the fact that NO account has been made for the road infrastructure around Guildford and particularly my village of Compton, where I live on the main street through Compton. Our village life has been ruined due to the heavy traffic on this B Road! More houses will exacerbate this problem as rarely do drivers do even the 30 Mph asked for.

The council have consistently ignored our requests about this and I have to object to the development which seems to exceed the number of houses that I feel that field could accommodate comfortably and for quality of life. I believe 1,800 are planned with an 'industrial park' added to it! Down Lane, running on one side of the field is already a small road as you know and can't handle the numbers you seem to expect as this road will be used.

For our problem in Compton, please immediately place a 25mph zone from Cyprus Farm to just beyond St Nicholas Church or even Lemon Tree Restaurant. Which is to be enforced by a camera at all times. We need an electronic board at either end permanently showing 25 mph. We also need a pedestrian crossing immediately outside Mission Cottage gate to go over to the right hand side of Eastbury lane, presently has no pavement area and this can be built on this corner (I could show you) there is nothing there except an impromptu flower bed, this crossing must have a traffic light. More and more of us, who have no driveways are forced to park our cars in Eastbury Lane and it is DANGEROUS! to cross this road as the traffic does not slow down. I have elderly relatives and a newborn grandson. I don't allow my family to cross this road, we have to use the layby outside my neighbours house - 'the old post office', I have to drop them off, as well as heavy shopping and then park my car in Eastbury Lane. A walk into my village is fraught with worry as large lorries Sainsburys and Waitrose vans etc., drive very close to us on the pavement, they need to slow down.

It is very very obvious that if Guildford County Council want to provide more homes, then massive investment needs to be given for a series of tunnels under the south and east of Guildford linking up the A3 with Godalming and the Shalford, Cranleigh and Dorking areas. We are in a conservation area but this is completely wrecked by the traffic. You can't have it both ways. Show me the investment and plans for the traffic, then I will show you support for what you are trying to do if the numbers and plans make sense. We are not unreasonable but the council is ignoring us and you are ruining the quality of our lives, putting our lives in danger and affecting our house prices by the heavy traffic involved. I cannot support this at the present time and I OBJECT.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15143  Respondent: 15610561 / Jo Graham  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The area is not designed to take a huge influx of residents or vehicles. There is often flooding in the area, draining is insufficient and the infrastructure and road network is barely able to cope as it is.

Flooding of Ockham Road, the roundabout at Ockham Park (at the site of the Wisley proposal), Plough lane, Old Lane, Lower Road in Effingham are specific examples where there was significant flooding in the last two years which has caused damage to property, vehicles, roads not to mention the additional congestion this caused. The proposals that are suggested in the latest application do not go far enough to resolve any of these issues.

The roads in the area are not suitable for the additional volume of traffic and I would classify a number of them as country lanes. There are real examples of where roads are breaking up, repeated potholes, drains sinking as well as being dug up for utilities repairs and hence can barely cope with the current situation. Examples are Ockham Road (both North and South), Forest Road and the Drift.

As a keen cyclist, these poor road conditions make it challenging enough to ride on and I have significant concern on my safety should there be additional traffic on the roads, particularly as I have mentioned above that they are winding country lanes.

The proposal of the additional housing plus support and delivery vehicles would create a significant increase in traffic volume. The 2011 census indicated an average car ownership of 1.51 per household and no doubt that figure has risen since thus causing a significant increase in road users which the local infrastructure cannot support. As a daily user of the A3 and M25, the congestion is already extreme. During the week, traffic is already queuing for the M25 by 6.45am and this is likely to get worse should these proposals go ahead.

I believe the proposal to put these additional houses on the edge of the A3 / M25 will have severe impact on this already stressed journey and there are no proper proposals put forward to help justify or accommodate.

The rail network does not fair much better with trains to London already at capacity. During the week, the car park at both Horsley and Effingham Junction are busy to full. No doubt residents of the proposed developments would wish to use these stations and so would result in insufficient parking / cycle park facilities. Again, the proposal does not offer any suitable sustainable alternatives which would be acceptable from an environmental perspective or to the local residents and infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am registering my objection to the local plan.

The reason for objecting are that the local roads, including the A3 and M25 are already too congested and the proposed development will add further to the current level of congestion and pollution. The smaller roads through West Clandon, Ripley and Send cannot cope with the increased level of traffic that such developments will bring.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15424  Respondent: 15614497 / Hannah Yandle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):

• Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford.
• Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development.
• Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. I.e. most residents!
• Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15448  Respondent: 15614721 / Charles Leonard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The infrastructure is totally inadequate for all of the associated new traffic which would inevitably come from the building of hundreds of new homes and, even worse, the planned industrial premises and factories and warehousing etc. We do not want articulated lorries speeding along our country lanes.

No funding has been made available, nor has any funding been agreed by the Highways Agency for new roads and infrastructure. This fact came to light at a local plan consultation meeting at which Mr. Spooner of Guildford Borough Council was present, with a colleague, both of whom confirmed that there are, as yet, no plans in place by the Highways Agency for new roads in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15447  Respondent: 15614753 / Anthony McCulloch  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The infrastructure is totally inadequate for all of the associated new traffic which would inevitably come from the building of hundreds of new homes and, even worse, the planned industrial premises and factories and warehousing etc. We do not want articulated lorries speeding along our country lanes.

No funding has been made available, nor has any funding been agreed by the Highways Agency for new roads and infrastructure. This fact came to light at a local plan consultation meeting at which Mr. Spooner of Guildford Borough Council was present, with a colleague, both of whom confirmed that there are, as yet, no plans in place by the Highways Agency for new roads in this area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15457</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614753 / Anthony McCulloch</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The infrastructure is totally inadequate for all of the associated new traffic which would inevitably come from the building of hundreds of new homes and, even worse, the planned industrial premises and factories and warehousing etc. We do not want articulated lorries speeding along our country lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No funding has been made available, nor has any funding been agreed by the Highways Agency for new roads and infrastructure. This fact came to light at a local plan consultation meeting at which Mr. Spooner of Guildford Borough Council was present, with a colleague, both of whom confirmed that there are, as yet, no plans in place by the Highways Agency for new roads in this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15446</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614785 / Richard Palmer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services in the local area are also inadequate for the number of homes and business which are already here - e.g. drainage, gas mains, electricity and water services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our schools are already over-crowded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our doctors surgeries are at &quot;bursting -point&quot;. It takes several days to get to see a doctor at our local surgeries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15458</th>
<th>Respondent: 15614785 / Richard Palmer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The infrastructure is totally inadequate for all of the associated new traffic which would inevitably come from the building of hundreds of new homes and, even worse, the planned industrial premises and factories and warehousing etc. We do not want articulated lorries speeding along our country lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No funding has been made available, nor has any funding been agreed by the Highways Agency for new roads and infrastructure. This fact came to light at a local plan consultation meeting at which Mr. Spooner of Guildford Borough Council was present, with a colleague, both of whom confirmed that there are, as yet, no plans in place by the Highways Agency for new roads in this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other services in the local area are also inadequate for the number of homes and business which are already here - e.g. drainage, gas mains, electricity and water services.

Our schools are already over-crowded.

Our doctors surgeries are at "bursting-point". It takes several days to get to see a doctor at our local surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The infrastructure is totally inadequate for all of the associated new traffic which would inevitably come from the building of hundreds of new homes and, even worse, the planned industrial premises and factories and warehousing etc. We do not want articulated lorries speeding along our country lanes.

No funding has been made available, nor has any funding been agreed by the Highways Agency for new roads and infrastructure. This fact came to light at a local plan consultation meeting at which Mr. Spooner of Guildford Borough Council was present, with a colleague, both of whom confirmed that there are, as yet, no plans in place by the Highways Agency for new roads in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/15461  Respondent: 15615265 / Clive Pott  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Other services in the local area are also inadequate for the number of homes and business which are already here - e.g. drainage, gas mains, electricity and water services.

Our schools are already over-crowded.

Our doctors surgeries are at "bursting-point". It takes several days to get to see a doctor at our local surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15442  Respondent: 15615297 / Carole Butcher  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The infrastructure is totally inadequate for all of the associated new traffic which would inevitably come from the building of hundreds of new homes and, even worse, the planned industrial premises and factories and warehousing etc. We do not want articulated lorries speeding along our country lanes.

No funding has been made available, nor has any funding been agreed by the Highways Agency for new roads and infrastructure. This fact came to light at a local plan consultation meeting at which Mr. Spooner of Guildford Borough Council was present, with a colleague, both of whom confirmed that there are, as yet, no plans in place by the Highways Agency for new roads in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15462  Respondent: 15615297 / Carole Butcher  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Other services in the local area are also inadequate for the number of homes and business which are already here - e.g. drainage, gas mains, electricity and water services.

Our schools are already over-crowded.

Our doctors surgeries are at "bursting-point". It takes several days to get to see a doctor at our local surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy i3 - Sustainable Transport for new developments

• The proposed policy is unrealistic and lacking clarity or credibility in its wording regarding developers proposing and securing travel plans for their developments and contributing to transport arrangements for both the able and disabled.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15634  Respondent: 15618305 / Lawrence Claridge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15633  Respondent: 15618337 / Matthew Pitt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15654  Respondent: 15618561 / Howard Klein  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There are already increasing concerns regarding parking in the centres of both Burpham and Merrow, both will become exacerbated with new developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15660  Respondent: 15618689 / Julia Ray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The developments being proposed are vast and the consequences will be felt on peoples health with the increased pollution. I have a daughter with asthma and know how serious childhood illnesses exacerbated by pollution can be.

The traffic is already horrendous, we do not want more cars on the roads. There are currently just sufficient parking spaces in Ripley and around. It would not take many more cars on the roads to tip that balance and make for example taking the kids to the park, an impossibility for those who already need to drive into the village centres. The frustrations of congested roads decreases our quality of life as they are horribly stressful, together with the pollution caused and damage to our environment. Many of the roads already require passing places as they are narrow - more traffic will increase the number of accidents as more cars try to navigate these narrow roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15682  Respondent: 15618881 / Jayne Barmby  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT. This is another vaguely aspirational policy, based on wishful thinking and not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the issues and Options paper and then to the 2014 draft local plan specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in East and west Horsley and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well
as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.
The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust.

One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day, as I used to do. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.
Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. Well-off pensioners seem to be the main beneficiaries. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.
Forget about water buses. The Wey is too narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.
The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15715  Respondent: 15619041 / Jack Cross  Agent:

Policy I3 - Sustainable Transport for New Developments

I strongly object to any development being built that does not have existing sustainable transport. Blackwell Farm, Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill and Garlicks Arch do not have such facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15729  Respondent: 15623425 / Jean Davy  Agent:

The already impossible TRAFFIC CONGESTION in Burpham will become even more impossible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15754  Respondent: 15623745 / Stella May  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3 - Sustainable Transport for New Developments

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments. This is another aspirational policy, not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport. The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths. The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK. The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times. Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town. I like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services. The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented. Ie. Cost of housing will increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Transport:

The evidence on future traffic conditions which has been provided in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report was produced late and is incomplete. Critical information on congestion has not been given in time to be taken into account in the plan proposals.

The proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor is simple unsound and cannot be delivered due to the narrow roads and pinch points on an already very congested route through Burpham.

Of further note is that the proposed Gosden Hill development of 2000 houses plus offices, school etc will add significant pressure to the already congested London road and New Inn Lane. The increase in solution and noise is unacceptable.

The phasing of the proposed Gosden Hill development is in advance of proposed improvements to the A3. This makes no sense.

The major transport issues around Guildford need to be resolved before any further development is considered, these include the proposed A3 tunnel, new river crossing, a workable central bus terminal and a rail station at Merrow.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15929  Respondent: 15627105 / Julia McClung  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

The increased volume of car traffic.

- The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in the Horsleys and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.
- The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).
- The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
- The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Horsley and Effingham cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15933  Respondent: 15627137 / Katie McClung  Agent:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:

a. The increased volume of car traffic.

b. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in the Horsleys and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.

c. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).

d. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

e. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Horsley and Effingham cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/15937  **Respondent:** 15627265 / Rachel McClung  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

The words “Roads and Transport Infrastructure” are mentioned in Definitions under Policy I1 (Infrastructure and Delivery), but no detail for West Horsley has been found in any of the Local Plan documents, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). 5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of the identities of the villages. There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in West Horsley, East Horsley, Normandy, Ockham, Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that. The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses in such a small area means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Under the current economic climate, it is unlikely any additional funding will be made available for new capital projects. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan.

Policy I3 provides that developers “will be expected” to propose and secure travel plans for their developments and contribute to transport arrangements for the able and disabled. Legally, this is meaningless - this proposed policy lacks ‘teeth’ and is unrealistic where development and major housebuilding companies are involved.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. It has been shown that Wisley already has NOX levels above the EU legal limits and by law a school cannot be located in this area as a result.
Whilst Horsley station has frequent trains to London and Guildford seven days a week, the station car park is normally full on weekdays. An increase in village population will increase pressure on station parking and traffic movements to/from Horsley station, to drop off/collect travellers to London and school children going to Guildford and Leatherhead.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15948</th>
<th>Respondent: 15627329 / Loraine Crates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to any further degradation of roads caused by increased traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15960</th>
<th>Respondent: 15627809 / Fazia Cater</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport requirements arising from an expansion have also not been thought through, and nor have existing transport problems been addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16078</th>
<th>Respondent: 15631105 / Pamela Jacqueline Hagan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to poor air quality (policy 13).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The huge changes in development planned in the north east of the borough will particularly to increased congestion and, therefore, a rise in air pollution. This will adversely affect the lives and health of the local residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16092</th>
<th>Respondent: 15631553 / Anthony Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Comment ID: PSLPP16/16246  
**Respondent:** 15636481 / Peta Lawrence  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object that housing being proposed on the Green Belt will increase traffic bringing increased danger and pollution and slower journey times on our already overcrowded village roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/16488  
**Respondent:** 15639841 / May Craft  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The existing road network around Guildford is essentially at full capacity. Major road infrastructure initiatives, such as an A3 ‘by-pass’ tunnel, need to be assessed before housing sites can be defined.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPP16/16349  
**Respondent:** 15640897 / Jackie van Heesewijk  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists needed

Improved road safety to ameliorate the village environment for cyclists and pedestrians is vital. GBC should work with the highways authority and enforcement agencies to apply a zero tolerance attitude towards antisocial, dangerous and aggressive motorists. Safety for sustainable travel attracts insufficient attention in your Local Plan.

Generally, much more work needs to be done by GBC (in conjunction with Surrey County Council as the highways authority and the Parish Councils) to slow motor vehicles and to protect pedestrians and cyclists in East and West Horsley. The potential proposals in relation to East and West Horsley and Ockham give insufficient consideration to the infrastructure and the inability of the current road network to satisfactorily service the increased demand that would be placed upon it by potential development.

The roads in the villages are inappropriate for existing traffic using them and something must be done to ensure that they are no longer used as a cut through by commercial vehicles seeking to avoid the major trunk road network: this needs to be carefully considered as part of the local plan adoption process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I OBJECT TO POLICY I3 (SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT):** • Just a list of generic measures, not related to real life or the particularities of Guildford. • Fails to treat sustainability as a constraint. Assumes excessive levels of development proposed in the plan can be supported by sustainable development. • Unrealistic. Most people can’t or won’t walk or cycle – commuters in a hurry, the elderly, children, people who are unwell or unfit, people carrying heavy shopping or other goods. i.e. most residents! • Town’s eye view of transport. Ignores scarcity of existing rural public transport and commercial unviability of increasing it. Ignores terrible state of Surrey’s roads, potholes, flooding etc. Ignores extra stress to be created by huge new housing estates in countryside.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPP16/16362  Respondent: 15641281 / Paula Redmond  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)**

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.”

The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable increases in congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

The Plan does not consider the cumulative effects in conjunction with Albury Heath AONB Compressed Natural Gas extraction plans which have just been approved by Surrey County Council and falls within Guildford Borough Council

The Plan does not consider the wider environmental effects in conjunction with the 200 other Green Belt site being developed by local councils around London Area or its effect on all residents in and around the M25 area.

The Plan does not consider the cumulative impacts on TBH and London and South East nature reserves and wildlife habitats.

The Plan does not consider the cumulative impacts of the Plan in conjunction with the possible development of 3rd runway at Heathrow and associated damage to air quality.

The Plan does not mention or show calculations of the considerable damage to air quality during demolition and construction phases as well as completion.

The Plan does not quantify or assess the extreme disturbance to local residents and wildlife during the construction phases which will be continuous over many years – this is unacceptable and unsustainable, especially when combined with Surrey County Council’s Compressed Natural Gas Extraction site at Albury Heath AONB.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety I3

I specifically object to:

1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated and, even within the development itself, too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars.

1. **The increased volume of car traffic.** A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads.

1. **The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads** in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements.

1. **The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians,** due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them).

1. **The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25.** A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest.

1. **The lack of suitable public transport.** The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity.

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously

Air pollution in many parts of the borough, particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is **already in excess of EU-permitted levels.** Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
population around the site but to those on the route to the ultimate destination. A recent US study, by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, showed that vehicle crashes are the single biggest cause of fatalities to oil and gas workers while the increase in onshore gas production has resulted in a 350% increase in traffic fatalities in regions where gas production is occurring.

The increase in traffic will also increase local pollution levels, vehicles transporting plant, equipment, workers and compressed gas are mostly heavy diesel engined vehicles - the most polluting to the environment. A recent NHS study showed that 40,000 deaths in the UK each year are directly caused by pollution.

Evidence was found to suggest that long-term exposure to air pollution is linked to:

- decline in lung function in adults – which can be a risk factor for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
- asthma
- type 2 diabetes
- problems with brain development and cognition (thinking ability)
- cardiovascular diseases – conditions that can affect the heart and blood vessels, such as coronary heart disease
- cancer

15 years of 24/7 gas production activity will create unacceptable increases in local pollution levels, affecting the public, local residents, wildlife and ecosystem. The Green Belt is designed not only to provide ‘openness’ and prevent ‘urban sprawl’ but also to provide compensation for human polluting activities and to maintain biodiversity supporting our ecosystem, absorbing carbon and other pollutants from the environment and helping to clean our air, which is already failing to meet levels for good health. Damaging the Green Belt and cutting ancient woodland has a devastating effect on human health and local wildlife.

Albury civil parish spans the small village and three hamlets, which are Farley Green, Little London and adjacent Brook – spaced out by Albury Heath, Foxholes Wood, small fields and Albury Park. About a third of Blackheath Common on the Greensand Ridge is in the parish, which centrally nestles in the ‘Vale of Holmesdale’. Albury new village is at the point where the Sherborne flowing from near Newlands Corner via the Silent Pool joins the Tillingbourne that runs through the centre of the village and until the 20th century fed the flour mill at the Chilworth edge of the village. The old village lies within Albury Park. There is another brook leading into Chilworth called Law Brook which Brook is centred on. The potential for polluting these local water courses which support a range of wildlife, is unacceptable. The area contains and is adjacent to nature reserves, National Trust sites and SSSIs which provide habitats to a number of rare and endangered species.

The roads around an AONB are totally inappropriate for these sorts of vehicle movements, and the villages the HGVs will pass through are densely populated and the roads very narrow in places, frequently used by walkers, cyclists, and passing birds and wildlife (particularly during migrations and breeding seasons when wildlife populations can increase greatly and are more vulnerable with young), the risk of accident, injury and death is unacceptable. There are regular small cycling groups as well as large organised events using the roads in Albury and nearby, the Surrey Hills Cyclone Sportive passes through Albury, The Dirty Weekend series and many others. This will create unacceptable road and health hazards for the cyclists and increased congestion for everyone during these times.

If the proposals by Guildford Borough Council for development of 20,000 new dwellings in the Guildford area go ahead, including several thousand properties and associated urban development around the nearby villages of East/West Clandon, East/West Horsley, Wisley, Ripley, Send Marsh, Pyrford, Ockham, etc. the cumulative effect of increased vehicle numbers during construction and thence from new residents (20,000 new properties will likely swell local populations by around 45,000 and their vehicles) will cause utter carnage. Recent heavy rainfall caused flooding at the A3 underpass at Kingston causing a 3hr traffic jam back as far as Ripley and surrounding villages (I had the pleasure of being caught up in it personally), which shows that these roads cannot cope with the volume of traffic as it is, particularly during poor weather or if there is an incident or accident blocking the roads. The added pressure on the A3, A25, A246 and knock-on effect on the M25 will be intolerable even in the best of conditions. The cumulative effect on local pollution, congestion, competition for space, resources and amenities, and detrimental effect on health of local communities and wider populations will be very significant. It’s like watching a perfect storm forming with Guildford at the centre.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16385  Respondent: 15641569 / Trevalyn Gregory  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16411  Respondent: 15644225 / Patricia Savin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In addition to the principal objection on the grounds of the impact upon the Green Belt, I also consider that there are fundamental and insurmountable issues associated with the capacity of the existing infrastructure in this part of the Borough, which wholly precludes further development of the level identified. Not only is the strategic highway network already at capacity at peak times, particularly on the A3, but the local network is also under considerable pressure, which I do not consider would be alleviated by the addition of a new A3 junction or piecemeal upgrading.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16554  Respondent: 15647265 / Keith Grainger  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND POLLUTION

Roads and country lanes are already congested at peak times. Increased traffic will result in more accidents and greater pollution. Many are already unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians. For example, Ockham Road South is narrow for the volume of traffic it carries, is dangerous to cross and the pavement is unsafe for pedestrians in a number of places.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Increased pollution

The Green Belt acts as a physical barrier between the urban areas and the countryside, resulting in improved air quality in urban centres and the loss of such valuable green spaces will lead to the irreversible loss of a carbon sink for air pollution. In addition, the proposed number of houses will inevitably lead to a significant increase in the volume of traffic, increasing the levels of nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment, hence exacerbating an area of concern already present in several areas of the Borough.

In addition to my objection to site reference A36 as mentioned above, I also object to any significant increase in the number of dwellings in the villages of East and West Horsley or in the surrounding neighbourhoods. In particular, I object to the proposal of 2,000 homes at former Wisley airfield (Ref A35) and the further 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm (Ref A25). These two sites will cause huge pressures on the Horsley villages and I do not believe the villages are capable of supporting and withstanding such pressures. My concerns are outlined below:

Pressure on road system

The roads in the villages of East and West Horsley are currently not maintained to a desirable standard. Hence, it seems reasonable to anticipate that any increase on the current number of users could only cause these stretches of road to deteriorate more rapidly. With the proposal of large nearby sites such as A35 and A25 as well as many new developments within the villages themselves, many of the roads could be required to take on hundreds of new users. Many of these roads are narrow and often in poor condition and hence heavy traffic and large vehicles, such as lorries or tractors, will cause these roads to become congested and dangerous. Furthermore, there are often narrow or non-existent stretches of pavement along many of these roads which will become even more dangerous for all users, in particular the elderly, wheelchair users and pushchairs. In the majority of cases, there is no potential to expand these roads or pavements.

Pressure on rail network

As a commuter to London, I have experienced many overfilled trains at peak times and hence an increase in the commuter population could only exacerbate this problem.

Pressure on parking

Parking at Horsley and Effingham Junction stations is already at capacity at peak times with the current number of users and so a significant increase in users is likely to heighten this problem. Additionally, there will be further strain on the parking at the shops, medical centre and village hall in the centre of East Horsley. There are many elderly residents in both villages and it is of great concern to me that they may not be able to access parking spaces sufficiently close to the services they require with this increase in demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
In particular we object to villages being removed from the green belt, and the increase in traffic congestion that would occur. The A247 has at many places got narrow footpaths on one side of the road, making it extremely dangerous when traffic mounts the pavements – as often happens with lorries passing through.

We are also concerned about the following:-

- A247 would be more used more by the Sat. Nav.
- Environment: Health hazard – air pollution - Noise and the affect that has on nerves - Loss of green fields. People need to see greenery.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16806  Respondent: 15652833 / Don Babington  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16886  Respondent: 15657121 / Robert Wheeler  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

What is so baffling, is that you come with up with these silly ideas like "oh we'll just put 2000 homes here" but don't think about the ramifications of how that will affect the local area. There are already too many cars on the roads around Ripley, Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common, Horsley, Clandon that during peak times the slightest accident can cause a mile tail back and bring a village to a stand still. The volume of traffic on the roads everyday increase the wear and tear on the roads which lead to potholes and unsafe driving conditions. Two thousand homes, just think about the stupid amount of traffic that that will increase, think about the excess petrol fumes and what effect that will have on the seldom areas of greenery that you choose to leave standing. This ridiculous idea of turning Burnt Common into Slyfield Greens [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature], and what's the thinking behind Garlick's Arch? That all residence who live on that development will come and go only via the A3? Because there's no way that Portsmouth Road is going to manage with that added level of traffic EVERY DAY. So now you have an abundance of traffic joining the A3. All this will do is turn the A3 into a car park and I know what your answer will be for that. "We'll just make it four lanes each side", after all what's a few less trees and Wisley right?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

East and West Horsley and much of the local area enjoy significant numbers of visitors, on foot, by car and more often on bikes; these proposals will destroy the area as we know it whilst putting the lives of visitors and residents at risk. This should NOT be allowed to happen. Please reconsider your justification for the New Plan in its entirety along with the damage and inconvenience to existing residents, please do NOT let this happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the fact that infrastructure planning for sites has not been properly addressed. There is a huge infrastructure deficit. Sites which will rely on the private car must be excluded from the local plan. Unrealistic transport plans put forward by developers need to be rejected.

I object to the fact that many of the allocated sites are being planned in unsustainable locations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the lack of consideration for the protection of heritage assets. There appears to be no recognition that the number of HGVs used during major construction either of infrastructure or housing has a huge negative impact on listed buildings due to shaking foundations and increase in pollution (and impact on brickwork/mortar etc).

I object due to the inadequate protection of the environment in terms of wildlife, SNCIs, SPA; in terms of air pollution and noise and light pollution.

I object due to the fact that local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed by large numbers of additional residents – it is already difficult to get an appointment at the GP and the RSCH is failing to meet waiting times for outpatients' appointments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the proposed housing developments at Wisley Airfield (A35) and Garlick’s Arch (A43) as they have very limited public transport facilities ie; no railway stations and inadequate bus services, which will therefore lead to increased levels of private car use.

I object to the developments at Wisley Airfield, Garlick's Arch and within the Horsleys villages as the car parks at the railway stations of Horsley and Effingham at already at capacity.

I object to the plan as it lacks detail for a cycle infrastructure which might mitigate increased private car use.

I object to the local plan as these developments should be in urban areas where there is sustainable transport.

I object to the local plan as the increased levels of NO2 and PARTICULATES in the air may cause SIGNIFICANT health risks to the adults and children living within the strategic sites and proposed high density levels of development within the Ockham, Send, Ripley and Horsleys villages.

I object as the levels of Air quality pollutants produced by the construction and then the increased local traffic are likely to breach European rules and regulations and therefore leave the council and therefore the council tax payer liable to fines.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17399  Respondent: 15682465 / Nick Beesly  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure Policies: The infrastructure policies are sensible. Policy 13 "Sustainable transport for new developments" and Policy 14 "Green and blue infrastructure" are important and I support each of them. Blackwell distinguishes itself in each of these areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17476  Respondent: 15687201 / Mandy Cox  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17492  Respondent: 15687329 / Kim Sweeting  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Traffic will increase significantly and the access and exit roads to and from the A3 are too narrow to cope with the resultant increase in traffic - particularly at peak hours.
2. Light and sound pollution.
   The area enjoys fairly dark skies for its proximity to London. Any additional development will add to the light pollution unless provisions are made to ensure strict control of any additional lighting. Please consult Guildford
Astronomical Society.
It already suffers from noise pollution from the A3. Traffic noise pollution seems inevitable if development proceeds.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17621</th>
<th>Respondent: 15688481 / Sally Lescher</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to policy I3 Sustainable transport for new developments.

This is another aspirational policy, not grounded in the practical realities of daily life. It consists of a standard, box-ticking list of local government measures unrelated to the specifics of the plan. Like infrastructure, transport appears to be an afterthought; the policy fails in its essential job of guiding planning decisions, since it assumes development of any kind can be supported by sustainable transport.

The sustainability of the dormitory settlements which the Council want built across the countryside depends on a general “modal shift” from private car use to walking, cycling and public transport. This is unrealistic. The proposed sites are often miles away from the nearest railway station. Bus services even in the largest villages are almost non-existent – just one bus to and from Guildford each day in the Horsleys and none at weekends. Since bus services depend on profitability, they cannot be expanded and the Council are not proposing to subsidise new ones. Rural buses are too slow anyway for busy people. Most rural roads in the borough are narrow, winding, hilly, potholed, muddy and unlit. Many flood badly and have no footpaths.

The desired modal shift would require a comprehensive co-ordination of bus and train timetables with services every few minutes, seven days a week, to stops within walking distance of every home in the borough. This kind of integrated public transport system has been achieved in Switzerland, for instance, but only at huge public cost and thanks to a political consensus supporting state ownership of trains, buses and the post office, which delivers rural passengers as well as mail. There is absolutely no chance of this in the UK.

The vast majority of the borough’s residents are not, in practice, able to cycle. This includes children, the elderly, commuters who have to look smart, the infirm, the unfit and people carrying goods or shopping of any kind. Dependence on walking and cycling discriminates against these groups, which include some of the most vulnerable members of the community. It is socially unjust. One in two working people in Guildford commute for up to 3 hours a day. They will not leave their cars for even part of their journey if it means longer travel times.

Park-and-rides are a welcome part of the transport mix but are too slow for commuters and others on a tight schedule. For an adult couple going shopping it is still cheaper to park in town.

I like the idea of water buses but have concerns over the reality. The Wey is narrow and, with a river speed limit of 4mph, boats are too slow for anything but recreation. Except on the tideway, not even the Thames has such services.

The addition of two new stations appears attractive but will slow down train journeys, which are already slower than at any time since the 1930s. Knock-on effects on localities where the new stations are built have not been worked out or presented. Ie. Cost of housing will increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17669  Respondent: 15693185 / Susan Wade  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The transport infrastructure, both in the town but in particular along the A3 corridor are not fit to support the proposed level of housing needs and consequently the extra traffic. Major issues such as a central bus facility close to the railway station have also not been resolved. Without improvements to support growth Guildford will become grid-locked.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17688  Respondent: 15694113 / Claire Netherton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Due to the absence of cycling paths and the lack of footpaths (and the space to provide them) the assertion that the development would result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking is unbelievable. The increased traffic would add danger to cyclists and pedestrians (including those increasingly using local roads for recreational purposes).

Object to the issue of air quality not being taken seriously. Air pollution in this area in the north of the Borough of Guildford and the south of the Borough of Elmbridge and particularly near the M25/A3 junction already exceeds EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic would worsen the situation, affecting the health of all current and future residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17713  Respondent: 15697921 / Chris Smedmore  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to sites A25 and A35 for the same reasons as above. The sheer scale of the developments is disproportionate and will stretch local resources beyond measure as well as significantly detracting from the current natural beauty in the surrounding areas which are protected by a greenbelt for good reason and should continue to be protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17742</th>
<th>Respondent: 15699201 / Robert Griffin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any plans to pedestrianize essential routes though central Guildford, without providing replacement routes (which would be extremely challenging) are also very naive and short sighted. The only solution to the terrible congestion and traffic problems within Guildford, are to discourage drivers, or to build a bypass. Non essential commuter traffic passing through Guildford and its surrounding villages should be discouraged, perhaps with tolls (that should not be levied on local residents!) and with business rate incentives for companies who work within the local area and employ staff living within the local area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17744</th>
<th>Respondent: 15699201 / Robert Griffin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the recent small scale alterations to Guildfords roads and the closing of pedestrian underpasses, have been very ill conceived ideas. The junction at Waitrose, the underpass at the bottom of the high street and removal of the road side pull-ins for buses on the A281 in Shalford. These all demonstrate a lack of foresight and have each ADDED to the congestion problems on Guildford,s busy roads. Such poor decisions really make me worry about the councils ability to plan, oversee and execute any large scale changes to the town and its surrounding area....

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17801</th>
<th>Respondent: 15702497 / Isabella Mitchell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I use the A247 to walk my dog to the park in centre of West Clandon. The road is already WAY too busy and unsuited to the current volume of traffic and LGVs. It’s only a matter of time before a pedestrian is killed on The Street.

I have also just passed my driving test and am already fed up with the congestion at the top of the A247 at the “Clandon Cross roads”

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17832</th>
<th>Respondent: 15703937 / Graham Vickery</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I use the A247 to walk my dog to the park in centre of West Clandon. The road is already WAY too busy and unsuited to the current volume of traffic and LGVs. It’s only a matter of time before a pedestrian is killed on The Street.

I have also just passed my driving test and am already fed up with the congestion at the top of the A247 at the “Clandon Cross roads”

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to no evident thought and absence of information provided to residents as to how access from existing roads to the proposed development sites will work. ie. traffic lights, mini roundabouts etc. Ockham Road to the junction with East Lane is already impassable at school arrival and leaving times. More than doubling such traffic will simply clog the roads and bring the villages to a standstill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the increase in traffic in Clandon and Ripley that would be caused by the planned development. There is a lack of public transport in these villages which means that the residents are heavily reliant on cars. The roads in these villages could not accommodate any increase in traffic. As a resident of West Clandon, I have experienced first hand the traffic on these roads. They are far too narrow in places and highly twisty in parts to accommodate any more traffic. It can be really difficult crossing the A247 in parts during rush hours and I would be worried that more cars on the A247 would be dangerous for the residents of Clandon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation congestion - existing roads and train routes (and the associated car parking facilities) already struggle to cope with the current daily load factors resulting in car transport tailbacks and train overcrowding at peak times. Adding more people and cars will only exacerbate this problem. Additionally, during the many years required to construct these houses, the road users and residents will be subject to significant inconvenience from the movement of heavy lorries and equipment and the delivery of building materials which will, doubtless, cause significant wear and tear on the roads (which it seems even now are only repaired infrequently).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17872  Respondent: 15705537 / G-Bug – The Guildford Cycling Campaign (Doug Clare)

Policy I3

Please add the bullet points below:

• New developments must include segregated cycleways linking to nearby schools and the Guildford Cycle network
• All new houses must have cycle storage and safe cycle parking must be provided on site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17883  Respondent: 15705729 / Martyn Heard

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on the health of local residents especially the young and elderly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17887  Respondent: 15705761 / David Jenner

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I3

Please add the bullet points below:

• New developments must include segregated cycleways linking to nearby schools and the Guildford Cycle network
• All new houses must have cycle storage and safe cycle parking must be provided on site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With lack of good air quality due to congestion especially in the construction stage, although even now there are problems with the numbers of diesel vehicles especially HGVs, I have concerns about healthy living. (Policy I3) This is a great place to live, but GBC is intent on destroying it.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/18108  Respondent: 15705857 / GRH Hampshire  Agent:**

**Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3**

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Wisley proposal will become a ghetto with limit access in and out. Suggesting that inhabitants would drive to Horsley to catch the train is unsustainable – the car park is full, as are the trains.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/18109  Respondent: 15705857 / GRH Hampshire  Agent:**

**Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3**

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Stating that Horsley station can become a bus station is simply risible.

The A3 is full with no proposals to provide more road capacity

In fact the whole thing is risible.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPP16/18171  Respondent: 15706689 / Hope Sarti  Agent:**

**Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3**

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the council failing to deliver sufficient infrastructure to cope with the proposed development within this area of the borough. The bus network is almost non-existent and new buses are linked only to the Wisley development. The train station car-parks at Horsley and Effingham junction are always full and there is no space to enlarge them. The roads are not suitable for commuters to cycle any distance due to the narrowness of the roads, speed of traffic and lack of space to build cycle paths.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18433  Respondent: 15724353 / Arvnid Parmar  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18464  Respondent: 15724673 / Matthew Bell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18472  Respondent: 15724801 / Talei Fawcett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID3
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The increased congestion that will arise from the massive proposed developments will in turn lead to increased air pollution which will have damaging effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

POLICY ID3: SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS

Highways England is supportive of the changes to Policy ID3, which are required to help maintain the safe operation and performance of the SRN.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Item 4.6.20 makes a statement that is clearly at odds with the choice of sites which will generate a major increase in private motor vehicle journeys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Item 4.6.20 makes a statement that is clearly at odds with the choice of sites which will generate a major increase in private motor vehicle journeys.
OBJECT. It is not sustainable to build dormitory towns and call them sustainable – the further from the town centre, the less sustainable

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/177  Respondent: 17240193 / Anita Aptel  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2056  Respondent: 17243169 / RSPB (Chloe Rose)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Sustainable transport for new developments

Paragraph 4.6.20: The RSPB support the inclusion of the requirement that developments that generate significant movement should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However, the RSPB is concerned that the proposed development at the Wisley airfield is not consistent with this policy due to its relatively remote location, away from established employment and service opportunities and lack of adequate public transport connections.

It is important that the impact of the proposed improvements to the M25/A3 Junction should be considered in combination with likely impacts of the Wisley Airfield scheme. These improvements are anticipated to have an adverse effect on the SPA and it is essential that the impacts of the Wisley Airfield scheme are considered in combination with this road scheme.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp171/346  Respondent: 17267393 / Steve Knight  Agent:  

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3  

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I support the additions that state that any new developments must take into account the impact on air quality, noise and the environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/361  Respondent: 17267745 / Maureen Knight  Agent:  

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3  

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I support the additions that state that any new developments must take into account the impact on air quality, noise and the environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/651  Respondent: 17300801 / Tom Saunders  Agent:  

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3  

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am a young professional, born in Guildford and currently residing as a homeowner in Burpham with concerns over the council's attitude towards current and potential future residents of the Borough's quality of life. I wanted my comments to be acknowledged with regard to the proposed local plan on both a subjective and objective basis as I would think it is people of my demographic you are looking to attract and keep in the area.

I am not overly against the building of new houses/flats, as I am led to believe we have a housing crisis in this country so understand the desire for growth, however I am concerned that the proposed development at Gosden Hill Farm will place too much of a burden on a local infrastructure (i.e. the roads in particular) which is already overwhelmed at peak times. I would urge the council to ensure that transport infrastructure is improved BEFORE any new housing development and not just to address the current deficit that is already evident, but to adequately provision for anticipated future growth beyond Gosden Hill Farm.

I have found it unclear from what I have seen in the plan about timelines for Gosden Hill Farm and the new southbound slip roads for the A3, but my concern stems from observing housing development near the train station and by the cricket ground on Woodbridge Road. Given that I would expect each household to have between 1 and 2 cars, how will the current road system cope with these new vehicles when people move in? It appears the council are (rather admirably) trying to address a housing crisis but leaving infrastructure as an afterthought, kicking infrastructure down the track for what will become a future problem; it will not simply go away! (and potentially drive people away from the area) Why let the current system get worse before trying to improve it?
While the borough's road system has been much maligned for as long as I have been alive, one positive I can say about where I live on Ladygrove drive, Burpham is the northbound slip roads onto and off of the A3. However, the following list are subjective observations of the problems I have when travelling to and from the south:

- Peak time congestion from Clay Lane all the way into the town centre. I may be inclined to take public transport but it isn't efficient enough: the bus takes too much time weaving around residential areas and then gets stuck in the same traffic either on London Road or Parkway anyway. This congestion is usually even worse on the way back home from work and what should be a 15 minute journey regularly turns into an hour.
- I often use Farnham Road Car Park, either to use the train for my client based work or because my company holds parking permits for Farnham Road when I am needed in our main Guildford Office. Due to the one-way system being gridlocked constantly at peak times, I am forced to join the A3 from the A25 for all of 30 seconds before I come off at the University roundabout to facilitate easier access to Farnham Road's Entrance. Either a southbound slip at Burpham or a road that better connects the A25 to the University roundabout (or both!) would be a clear way to alleviate traffic and improve traffic flow as I am sure I am not the only one who has a similar route.
- I often travel to Portsmouth at weekends and the issue of no southbound slip raises it's head once again as I am illogically forced to drive through Guildford and join congestion once again trying to then enter the A3. Southbound travel from north of Guildford centre is just horrendous.
- As mentioned earlier, I use the trains for work from time to time. I understand that the service through Guildford to Waterloo is one of the most crowded in the country and I can see why. It is on a par with, if not worse than a London tube carriage and again, expansion needs to be considered before more houses. I am not sure where the inhabitants of the new flats by the train tracks were expected to be accommodated by the transport system? A new station at Merrow will surely just add to the overcrowding rather than alleviate it.

Adding new houses at Gosden Hill will make these problems worse, so it is imperative that improvements are made before housing starts to be developed to ensure the high quality of life survey results Guildford has been receiving in recent times continues and to ensure the future prosperity of the area. I am afraid that if the council executes the plan in the same way they executed the box park 'village' last year, then the plan will be an unmitigated disaster. Although, the village has improved marginally since it's refurbishment, it appears that local resident views are not given the consideration they deserve and I would anticipate University students not staying in the area after graduation if the correct level of engagement is not achieved.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** pslp171/773  **Respondent:** 17303713 / Andrew Fitchie  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Transport

The amendments to the sustainable transport section seeking to mitigate the transport impacts of new development are supported as Guildford Borough is within commuting distance of MVDC by both car and train.

MVDC still consider that the Proposed Plan is sound and recognise the ongoing and previous Duty to Cooperate working that has taken place between our two Councils in the production of the Guildford Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/869</th>
<th>Respondent: 17308705 / University of Surrey (University of Surrey.)</th>
<th>Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Steve Molnar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY ID3: Sustainable transport for new developments</td>
<td>The University supports the changes to this policy that seeks to secure sustainable transport. The allocation at Blackwell Farm is a sustainable location for development as discussed in the PBA transport statement submitted with these comments.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td>📄 Blackwell Park Local Plan Transport Statement for Reps_10_7_17[1].pdf (754 KB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/964</th>
<th>Respondent: 17323265 / Simon Owen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3)</td>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: pslp171/1166  Respondent: 17343265 / Martin Brown  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I welcome the strengthening of Policy ID3. However, paragraphs (1) and paragraph 4.6.22 should be strengthened further by adding "add providing facilities for charging electric vehicles". I support the encouragement of walking, cycling and public transport, but as an older member of the borough, I am well aware that these forms of transport are often not possible for the very young and the elderly and they will continue to need to use private transport. Moreover, it is inevitable that people will continue to want to use their car, even if other options are available. The policy as a whole does not pay sufficient attention to this need of a substantial number of the population: however, the wider adoption of electric vehicles would have major benefits for the environment from reduced air pollution and noise pollution.

Paragraph 4.6.22 should be strengthened further by adding "and use of electric vehicles"

Paragraph 4.6.27 should be improved by changing 'can' in 'Such measures can include car clubs, car sharing, facilities for electric charging plug-in points" to 'should'

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

See above

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/1604  Respondent: 17406209 / Guildford Vision Group (Andrew Black)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY ID3 - Sustainable transport for new developments

3.72 A substantial amount of text and additional policy has been added to policy ID3 in relation to sustainable development, however, most of this text relates to vehicle movements and car parking.

3.73 GBC is assuming substantial modal shift in the town centre. GVG supports this aspiration. However, GVG believes the scale of modal shift proposed by the council – around 40% - will be very difficult to achieve due to the continuing need to access the town centre for retail and commercial activity and the Rail Station.

3.74 The inserted text at para 4.6.30a relates to Guildford town centre and recognises the congestion problem, especially the gyratory, as does GVG. The inserted text states that:

*This is, in part, a consequence of a mismatch between the demands for, and supply of, public off-street car parking on the different approach needs. The policy with respect to the provision of additional public off-street car parking is designed to reduce the impact of these trips on traffic volumes and congestion in the town centre. This planning policy will complement future environmental improvements in the town centre realising the Council’s ‘drive to, not through’ concept.*

3.75 GVG does not accept this explanation for congestion or the proposed solution.

3.76 The revised approach adopted by GBC on traffic completely ignores the role of Guildford as a regional and sub-regional destination. It also ignores the enhanced pull of Guildford if town centre regeneration comes forward at levels as expected by both GVG and GBC.
3.77 The approach of GBC is completely at odds with the principles of sustainable development and the requirement for modal shift away from cars to other forms of public transport.

3.78 The GBC plan is silent on measures to mitigate North South Traffic through the town centre which will be exacerbated by developments south of the borough e.g. major housing at Dunsfold and significant housing growth in Godalming. In the absence of any substantive plan to by-pass Guildford on a North-South axis, handling traffic from the A281, A3100 and A25, Guildford will have to support an increase North-South Traffic. The GVG Plan allows for traffic to be supported at current levels, whilst reducing accidents and pollution in the town centre. The GVG plan also provides for major environmental wins around areas allocated to housing, leisure, commerce and tourism in the town centre.

3.79 GVG supports the concept proposed by the council of ‘drive to, not through’ the GBC plan does not support this concept practically by creating provision for interceptor ‘Park and Ride’ car parks, or the better utilisation of bus and rail networks. The only new ‘Park and Ride’ in the plan appears at Gosden Hill linked to Guildford Station East proposals, but no capacity is proposed. The plan is silent on opportunities based at Shalford Station and north of the town in the Slyfied area.

3.80 GVG notes that there are approximately 5,800 car parking spaces in the town centre. Many of these spaces are in large surface parks that represent a lost opportunity for other uses. GVG are concerned that revenue generation from car parking may be clouding GBC’s long-term plan making judgement.

3.81 The masterplan as prepared by GVG demonstrates a pedestrian and cycle friendly environment where the gyratory is replaced with a new bridge link to take through traffic away from the town centre and from areas of high pedestrian activity. Whilst GVG accepts that according to the Guildford Town and Approaches Movement Study that highway interventions are generally unsuccessful in providing infrastructure solutions, the GVG crossing is about removing the maximum areas of conflict between town centre, pedestrians and vehicles. It delivers environmental improvements to the riverside, new homes, and will assist in achieving modal shift. The bridge link will also remove traffic from the proposed new housing, retail

3.82 and the visitor areas, leaving the town centre available for an improved pedestrian environment in close proximity to sustainable methods of transport, the retail core and a reconnected riverside. The GVG also allows for the creation of the proper transport interchange centred on a revised and expanded rail station. This crossing can be delivered in a phased approach without disturbing the current town centre.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/1979</th>
<th>Respondent: 17433985 / Stephen Pedley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus of the local plan on large scale development in the Ash and Tongham Urban Area will substantially increase the number of commuters travelling into Guildford for work and recreation. These commuters will be joined by those travelling from neighbouring boroughs adding to the congestion on roads that are already heavily congested. I support GBCs policies to increase access to and use of sustainable transport options, but I believe that the policies do not go far enough in creating an integrated network of cycling super-highways that are physically separated from the roads. These will provide safe routes for children to cycle to school (improving child health and reducing congestion around school gates), for people to cycle greater distances to work (cycle super-highways could connect Guildford with the surrounding towns and villages for up to a 12-mile radius), and for people to use for safe recreation. The cycle routes will be funded specifically by an additional levy placed on all new developments.
• Policy ID3 1 should read: New developments will contribute to the delivery of an integrated, accessible and safe transport system, including the construction of an integrated network of safe cycle and walking routes between Guildford and the surrounding towns and villages, maximising the use of the sustainable transport modes of walking and cycling for commuting and recreation, and the use of public and community transport.

• Policy ID3 2c should read: the creation of cycle and walking routes between Guildford and surrounding towns and villages, to local facilities, services, bus stops and railway stations, to ensure their effectiveness and amenity. To bring about the improvement, and expansion of existing routes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Policy ID3 1 should read: New developments will contribute to the delivery of an integrated, accessible and safe transport system, including the construction of an integrated network of safe cycle and walking routes between Guildford and the surrounding towns and villages, maximising the use of the sustainable transport modes of walking and cycling for commuting and recreation, and the use of public and community transport.

Policy ID3 2c should read: the creation of cycle and walking routes between Guildford and surrounding towns and villages, to local facilities, services, bus stops and railway stations, to ensure their effectiveness and amenity. To bring about the improvement, and expansion of existing routes.

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Policy ID4 - Green and blue infrastructure
Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure

We welcome this policy.

We propose that “slow the flow” and sustainable drainage schemes, intended to reduce flood risk, should be considered as also contributing to blue green infrastructure due to their wider benefits.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The introductory text has improved a little but the policy itself remains inadequate and lacks the joined up thinking required. The policy launches straight into “biodiversity” obligations.

We welcome the proposed SPD to set out opportunities and shape delivery of integrated multifunctional Blue Green Infrastructure.

We propose that “slow the flow” and sustainable drainage schemes, intended to reduce flood risk, should be considered as contributing to blue green infrastructure due to their wider benefits.

The addition of 4.6.49a is out of place here. It puts inappropriate focus on a specific proposal. It is already covered by national policy so an application can be considered with reference to this. Planners are well placed to balance and weigh different policy objectives when considering any application where the public interest requires a trade-off. Once you start referring to specific proposals in plan policies, where do you draw the line? Legitimate transport or health or flood risk management needs?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Policy I 4 (Green and Blue Infrastructure) – strong support for its aim of enhancing biodiversity. Paragraph 4.6.31.- For all the reasons mentioned above, please include the word “allotments” in the definition of Green Infrastructure.
We welcome the importance placed on the River Wey as a source of bio-diversity and open space. We suggest that an additional objective be added to make the Wey a continuous wildlife corridor.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/11422</th>
<th>Respondent: 8559297 / Holy Trinity Amenity Group (Robert Bromham)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Green and Blue Infrastructure, P116.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We welcome the importance placed on the River Wey as a source of bio-diversity and open space. We suggest that an additional objective be added to make the Wey a continuous wildlife corridor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3345</th>
<th>Respondent: 8560257 / Patricia Camp</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact on wildlife would be devastating. I am a keen and interested wildlife supporter and have observed many rare species of birds and wildlife in the local area. All these species would be under threat from loss of habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The valuable education and experience for schoolchildren visiting the area to learn about Nature conservation, preservation, protection of wildlife. The children are very keen and privileged to have the opportunity to visit the Surrey Green Belt area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp17/2041</th>
<th>Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE – TOPIC PAPER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2017) We broadly agree the context and content of this paper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17448</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563201 / West Horsley Parish Council (Sam Pinder)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document page number</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY I4 Green and blue infrastructure

WHPC supports this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16071  
Respondent: 8565601 / Tyting Society (David Thorp)  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Some 40 hectares of the Tyting farmland is proposed as a potential location for a SANG. In principle the Tyting Society is prepared to accept this proposal subject to a number of considerations.

- Maximising the agricultural use
  For over ten years the local community has been interested in securing the long-term future of the Tyting farmland in agricultural use. The most promising development over this long period has been the tenancy with Surrey Wildlife Trust who has successfully begun to restore this land since 2014. We therefore wish to encourage GBC to enter into an agreement for SWT to run the farm for a long period. We believe a way forward can be agreed whereby the grazing and conservation objective can be best met and be a good fit with SWT’s mission.
- Minimising footpath disruption
  From the initial plans seen to date, there are concerns regarding the extent and location of the paths in the farm and the proposed footpath accesses from White Lane and Halfpenny Lane. Both households adjacent to the path off White Lane are concerned about intrusion. The only mandatory element from Natural England is the circular route and so we support steps to minimise the interaction of cattle and free roaming dogs through a reduction in planned footpaths.
- Handling traffic and car parking
  Car parking for the SANG and additional traffic on White Lane and Halfpenny Lane are important safety and environmental issues. We are pleased to understand that no additional car park is being proposed to that currently enjoyed by walkers in the Tyting area.
Management of SANG monies
The Tyting Society cares about the future management of the SANG designated land as the farmland is central to the whole Tyting area. We are keen to find a mechanism with GBC for the management and use of SANG funds involving the local community on a regular basis.

We look forward to working with Guildford Borough Council to implement the proposed Tyting Farm SANG.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2504  Respondent: 8570273 / Fiona Curtis  Agent: Fiona Curtis
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure. This policy is confusing. It sits oddly with the plan's onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset 15 villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting. Land designated as 'open space' appears to be protected whereas land that is actually open space (ie Blackwell Farm, Wisley, Gosden Hill and Normandy strategic sites) is proposed for development? It would be useful to understand who will monitor this policy and how Independent will they be? Will biodiversity be their prime concern or will all concerns be secondary to development?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/296  Respondent: 8571521 / Surrey Nature Partnership (Sarah Jane Chimbwandira)  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We greatly welcome and support this enlightened policy, especially its references to the Surrey Nature Partnership and its work promoting the recognition of Biodiversity Opportunity Areas in 4.6.34-36 and 4.6.50. Additions at para. 4.6.42a-45 are useful and provide important clarity. With reference to para 4.6.50, we look forward to working with you on the intended Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document, where we can perhaps assist with interpreting the achievement of biodiversity net gain standards within the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9264  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure I object for the following reasons.
123. This policy has been constructed without reference to the Surrey Nature Partnership which, I understand, is supposed to inform a Countryside Vision and Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document neither of which appear to have been published or consulted on.

124. The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which I welcome. I also note and welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Area However the current plan to build on large areas of countryside, inset villages and create new village boundaries to encourage infilling in the Green Belt will have the opposite effect. The Policy appears to be a box-ticking exercise with no real teeth to it.

125. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

126. There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

127. Some quotations from relevant documents regarding the importance of biodiversity:

"The natural world, its biodiversity and its constituent ecosystems are critically important to our wellbeing and economic prosperity, but are consistently undervalued in conventional economic analyses and decision-making" (Biodiversity 2020 page 11)

"As a public authority in England you have a duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of your policy or decision making." (Government Planning Guidance)

Part of the problem is that "Biodiversity benefits are unpriced" and so not valued by those who look only at the more obvious and simplistic economic benefits.

128. I am concerned that "enhancing" the River Wey in the town centre will avoid using the available brownfield land around Walnut Tree Close and Slyfield for urban regeneration and sustainable housing that could otherwise be Why should the Walnut Tree Close/Woodbridge Meadows industrial area not be regenerated from bus garages, urban car parks and empty factories to offer sustainable, well designed, urban homes which are medium height, and can meet almost all of Guildford's real housing needs? It is vitally important for the town as a whole that the run-down Walnut Tree Close area is used for well-designed housing.

129. The plan involves an aggressive desire to push development on to the Green Belt at all costs, ignoring, or eliminating for other reasons, sites which could be used in the town for residential purposes. This has informed recent planning decisions (both the Aldi site and the Waitrose site were originally zoned for residential purposes and were eminently suitable for this) and this bias seems to be informing the ocal Plan to the detriment of our countryside, biodiversity and villages.

130. It is not clear what form the "parkland" along the River Wey will take but the images available in the Town Centre Master Plan suggest mown grass similar to the area around Millmead. This misses an opportunity to enhance biodiversity and enable town centre residents to engage with wild Engagement with wildlife should mean much more than throwing bread at ducks, chasing pigeons and antagonising swans. To achieve a wildlife corridor through Guildford, that can also benefit the health and well-being of residents living close by, the green space retained beside the river should be managed with the needs of wildlife in mind as well as people.

MONITORING

1. Simply maintaining open space will not be enough for a significantly enlarged population.
2. Providing more open space to meet existing shortfalls or the needs of a much larger population will reduce the area of land currently in food production or providing wildlife habitat.
3. SANG delivery is harming existing biodiversity
4. It is not clear how you will measure a change in biodiversity just by looking at planning applications. "Net gains in biodiversity provided by development" is a contradiction in terms. There may well be a few examples in England where low density housing has been combined with manufactured habitat at the expense of loss of agricultural land with no surrounding habitat damage - but I see no evidence of that in the Local Plan. Even when a housing development replaces agricultural land, it increases pressure on the surrounding countryside. A simple example is where houses border woodland and residents dump their garden rubbish (and often worse) over the garden fence. Increased leisure use on nearby countryside also has an adverse effect on biodiversity.
5. There is no guarantee that mitigations listed in an application will be carried out and their effectiveness is not guaranteed either. Guildford Borough Council would need to carry out follow-up ecological surveys on all sites.
Who would pay for these? Are there enough consultants to carry out the work in sufficient detail? What aspects of biodiversity will be measured?

6. How frequently are surveys by Natural England intended to take place? How will Guildford Borough Council ensure that Natural England carry them out? A baseline of existing surveys against which changes will be monitored should be included within the plan and it must be comprehensive for monitoring to be effective.

7. How frequently will SNCI surveys be carried out? At what expense? The last survey published in 2007 made recommendations for an increase in the size of the Wisley Airfield SNCI and stated that this should be taken into account for planning purposes. This was overridden in the recent planning inspector’s report and the Local Plan includes this particular SNCI as a building site. This is clearly a case of hypocrisy and suggests that the Council has no genuine intention to maintain biodiversity let alone enhance it.

8. My understanding is that a survey of SNCIs is currently taking place but that it is limited in scope to the previously known sites. This prevents other sites, where genuine biodiversity enhancement has taken place (often as a result of volunteer community effort), from being recognised in this way. While every stone is being turned over in the quest to find green space to build on, no genuine effort is being made to identify biodiversity hotspots that may have been overlooked in the past. In other words the approach being taken is one that intends to make no net gain, and possibly even reduce, sites of nature conservation interest – in contradiction to the stated aims.

9. If an existing SNCI (or one proposed on grounds of biodiversity but not formally accepted in a Local Plan) is found to be in poor condition the action taken should be to bring it back into good condition – not to remove its status and build on it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13027  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )


149. Additional evidence should include:

Existing SNCI surveys, including those that took place in 2004-2007.

Biodiversity evidence emerging from Neighbourhood Plans.

Evidence obtained by requests to local naturalists and natural history societies including those with a specialist interest / expertise.

MONITORING

150. Simply maintaining open space will not be enough for a significantly enlarged population.

151. Providing more open space to meet existing shortfalls or the needs of a much larger population will reduce the area of land currently in food production or providing wildlife habitat.

152. SANG delivery is harming existing biodiversity

153. It is not clear how you will measure a change in biodiversity just by looking at planning applications. “Net gains in biodiversity provided by development” is a contradiction in terms. There may well be a few examples in England where low density housing has been combined with manufactured habitat at the expense of loss of agricultural land with no surrounding habitat damage - but I see no evidence of that in the Local Plan. Even when a housing development replaces agricultural land, it increases pressure on the surrounding countryside. A simple example is where houses border
woodland and residents dump their garden rubbish (and often worse) over the garden fence. Increased leisure use on nearby countryside also has an adverse effect on biodiversity.

154. There is no guarantee that mitigations listed in an application will be carried out and their effectiveness is not guaranteed either. Guildford Borough Council would need to carry out follow-up ecological surveys on all sites. Who would pay for these? Are there enough consultants to carry out the work in sufficient detail? What aspects of biodiversity will be measured?

155. How frequently are surveys by Natural England intended to take place? How will Guildford Borough Council ensure that Natural England carry them out? A baseline of existing surveys against which changes will be monitored should be included within the plan and it must be comprehensive for monitoring to be effective.

156. How frequently will SNCI surveys be carried out? At what expense? The last survey published in 2007 made recommendations for an increase in the size of the Wisley Airfield SNCI and stated that this should be taken into account for planning purposes. This was overridden in the recent planning inspector’s report and the Local Plan includes this particular SNCI as a building site. This is clearly a case of hypocrisy and suggests that the Council has no genuine intention to maintain biodiversity let alone enhance it.

157. My understanding is that a survey of SNCIs is currently taking place but that it is limited in scope to the previously known sites. This prevents other sites, where genuine biodiversity enhancement has taken place (often as a result of volunteer community effort), from being recognised in this way. While every stone is being turned over in the quest to find green space to build on, no genuine effort is being made to identify biodiversity hotspots that may have been overlooked in the past. In other words the approach being taken is one that intends to make no net gain, and possibly even reduce, sites of nature conservation interest – in contradiction to the stated aims.

158. If an existing SNCI (or one proposed on grounds of biodiversity but not formally accepted in a Local Plan) is found to be in poor condition the action taken should be to bring it back into good condition – not to remove its status and build on it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13058  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Some comments on the policy notes:

131. 4.6.33 Villages are generally permeable to wildlife. The lower density of housing and presence of gardens (especially larger gardens) provides a corridor for movement across the residential area. Insetting of villages and the relaxation of planning restrictions in the Green Belt implied by Policy P2 will lead to infilling, “garden grabbing” and consequent loss of biodiversity. It will replace connections and corridors between habitats with barriers and lead to further fragmentation of our natural infrastructure.

132. 4.6.34 In the past Guildford Borough Council recognised the role that wildlife gardening and management of parks and open spaces for wildlife could play in enhancing biodiversity. There seems to have been a shift away from this. These aspects should be recognised in the Plan as well as the importance of Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and although 4.6.35 goes part way towards this we have yet to see the Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document or have an opportunity to comment on it.

133. 4.6.36 This is long overdue and should include the way that our lanes are managed. The current approach is unsympathetic, sometimes damaging tree roots and scarce native plants. It seems to be oriented towards encouraging faster traffic rather than recognising the traffic-calming effects of natural vegetation (See the original Quiet Lanes Initiative).
134. 4.6.38 I agree with this statement but public access is frequently damaging to biodiversity – the more obvious examples being dogs out of control in the vicinity of ground-nesting birds and trampling of grassland habitats. Public open space must be protected for the reasons given but wildlife needs undisturbed (or at least less disturbed) space too if it is to thrive.

Policy definitions:

135. This section starts with a definition that is not a proper definition and is followed by statements that are not definitions at all, apart from the last – suggesting that this part of the document has not been thought through or checked.

136. 4.6.42 “Biodiversity creation and/or enhancement” is not a definition – it requires definition.

Do you mean that you will create new species or encourage them to evolve? Or do you mean that you will increase the number of species living in the Borough, or the population of each species, or both?

137. The points made are aspirational that have no enforcement to back them.

138. I support the use of green roofs and walls.

139. Building on the countryside and increasing the population by such a large amount will not help vulnerable species. It will put added pressure on remaining habitats and increase light and air pollution, degrading the ability of the borough to support wildlife.

140. 4.6.44 This appears to be saying that you will deliberately put playing fields, sports facilities and other leisure activities in BOAs – but these are land uses that reduce biodiversity!

141. 4.6.43 Arrangements with developers have no guarantee of success or longevity. They involve partial mitigation and overall loss of the original biodiversity interest of a site.

142. 4.6.45 My understanding of SANG is that it is intended to reduce pressure on Special Protection Areas by providing an alternative area for people to walk their dogs – and hope that they do not prefer to use the SPA. In other words they are intended to attract the type of use that is damaging to vulnerable species such as ground-nesting birds. In the desperation to find SANG land Guildford Borough Council are making use of existing open space that will not attract people away from the SPA and they are ignoring the impact on existing wildlife. For example – Guildford Borough Council decided to include the towpath in the Parsonage Meadows SANG as a way of also facilitating a cycle route. Encouraging cyclists and dog-walkers to use the same narrow path will not encourage dog-walkers to use it rather than the SPA. At Effingham Common Guildford Borough Council plan to designate an important area for wildlife and ground-nesting Skylarks as SANG. The Council is riding roughshod over the opinions of the Commoners and local residents. The Council used to put up signage warning dog-walkers not to disturb the Skylarks during the nesting season – but these signs were not put up until well into the nesting season this year and only then after complaints and harassment of Skylarks by out-of-control dogs.

143. In allocating sites as SANG, Guildford Borough Council has ignored the requirement to consider existing biodiversity and clearly have little or any knowledge or understanding of the issue. The issues relating to Russell Place Farm have been pointed out by a qualified Biologist. Many invertebrates are dependent on the dung of grazing animals and this aspect of our countryside is being steadily driven out of our Borough.

144. 4.6.46 I welcome this acknowledgement of the damaging effects of the proposed building developments. This also has relevance to the manner in which the green spaces next to the River Wey are managed.

145. 4.6.47 I welcome the proposals but I am concerned that these may be no more than good intentions. How will Guildford Borough Council ensure that they are carried out fully – and paid for by the developer?

Reasoned Justification:

146. 4.6.50 As the emerging strategy for Surrey and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document are not yet available, or consulted on, the plan should not be proposing sites that will jeopardise them. The implication is that this aspect of the plan is not being taken seriously and will carry no weight in site selection despite the guidance in the NPPF.
147. 4.6.51 In fact some Guildford Borough Council contract mowing and lane management is not in line with a strategy that is meant to protect biodiversity.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** pslp171/1711  **Respondent:** 8573793 / Harry Eve  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

While there has been some improvement in the wording it is clear that the selection of Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) has been no more than a desktop exercise influenced by the proposal of new identified settlement boundaries, in this draft local plan, that were not fully thought through and which threaten landscape and biodiversity.

The addition of the words “where possible” is a let-out clause that demonstrates the reality that biodiversity will be greatly reduced by the many greenfield development sites proposed.

Important habitats for biodiversity (outside BOAs) are not restricted to those which are adjacent to BOAs. The policy appears to abandon them.

4.6.45 is misleading. The primary role of SANGs is to divert recreational use, and dog-walkers in particular, away from the TBHSPA. This requires making it more attractive in terms of access and lack of restrictions. It is extremely doubtful whether SANG will achieve its primary purpose. Existing biodiversity and recreational use is being ignored by GBC and developers in selecting sites. For example, dog walkers are being encouraged to use sites occupied by ground-nesting Skylarks. It is wrong to claim, in effect, that SANG will produce net gains in biodiversity when it will be used to justify the destruction of existing wildlife on greenfield sites by building on it.

I am suspicious of the introduction of 4.6.49a which appears to be an afterthought to weaken the policy. It could be taken as an indication of pre-determination in relation to certain local school proposals.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16191  **Respondent:** 8574881 / Melanie McLaren  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of the nearby

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5965  **Respondent:** 8575585 / Ian Macpherson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy 14: Green and blue infrastructure

I have not looked recently at the Water Framework Directive (blue infrastructure), but if it follows the normal pattern of Directives, then it is up to the member state to implement (mainly by way of national Regulation) and not directly by individuals. Revisit the drafting? In any case this will presumably be affected by Brexit?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7038  Respondent: 8575617 / Effingham Parish Council (Ian Symes)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I4 Infrastructure - Green and Blue Infrastructure

Support

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17571  Respondent: 8581505 / Burpham Neighbourhood Forum (Jim Allen)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This policy is in direct conflict with the Slyfield re-generation site situated in the 1901 flood plain. It is intended to ‘directly affect’ and cause material harm to the nature conservation interests of local sites (Riverside Nature Reserve). There can be no justification clear or otherwise to install 10 metre high lamp standards and disturb a landfill site or to move a waterworks which has been situated on ‘the perfect’ site for over 100 years to a location of ‘made land’.

Thus while commendable it fails the soundness test and is in conflict with other policies within the Plan.

Open Space

There is little point in saving 500 sq metres in the Town Centre when multiple 100’s of hectares are removed from the Green Belt.

SANG’s

Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces, these are ‘irresponsible’ designations of land. These paper designations do not physically change the sites from that of pre-designation and, save for the odd fence, gate and walk way, does nothing other than rename a location and become effectively Green Belt or Local Green Space by another name.

If an enclosed site is 100 hectares it is madness to label 50% SANG and 50% not SANG. It is only a designation on paper that changes rather than the sustainability of the site within Mother Nature. If the site was returned to Mother Nature from a farm yard or industrial site – this is fair designation. Designating open fields as SANGS is a meaningless paper exercise.

An unsound practice in the real world.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
We are concerned that plans to divert the Wey Navigation to permit non-essential development within the flood plain are being hidden behind these changes. Noting the EA has not prevented excessive erosion along the Wey between Stoke Lock and Bowers Lock since 2014. Over 150 trees are endangered by this policy.

A section in this policy referring to Local Green Spaces is required, as it is notably missing throughout this Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the deletion of the words: “having natural river banks as habitat”

Natural river banks not only enhance the habitat, but the landscape of the river. Hard concreted river banks destroy the natural appearance of rivers. Banks, in particular, raised above the level of the river are unnatural alongside a narrow river, such as the River Wey. Natural river banks are a way of bringing natural open space into towns and the countryside appearance of the River Way as it passes through the town has always been a feature of Guildford, contrasted by the Town Wharf and Bedford Wharf areas with the cinema and Electric Theatre.

The addition of this sentence is welcome. It is important that Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty used as SANGS should keep their natural beauty (the reason why they were designated as AONBs) and not be urbanised by man-made structures and additions.

Paragraph (4.6.45) would benefit from being worded more strongly to protect AONB land used as SANGS from urbanization and unnecessary car parks, which spoil their natural beauty.
The inclusion of Russell Place Farm as a SANG in the Local Plan on page 296, in my opinion amounts to pre-determination of planning application no: 13/P/01453, which has not yet been decided by the Borough Council despite the application being submitted almost three years ago.

A site visit was undertaken on 16 June 2016 after the s19 public consultation period has commenced.

With respect to all Traveller pitches I would expect DCLG Planning Policy for Traveller Sites August 2015 to apply.

The inset map for Wood Street Village is incorrect as it does not show the common land on Oak Hill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8573</th>
<th>Respondent: 8586977 / Ms Loraine Austin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is a lot of wildlife in the area, my home is directly opposite site A22 where there is an abundance of wildlife, even stag beetles which I believe are endangered. Frogs, birds, foxes, all sorts of things will be lost if the 140 planned homes and a care home are built on it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/981</th>
<th>Respondent: 8588961 / Mrs Margaret Knight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4: I support this policy in its aim of enhancing biodiversity supporting which the allotments do.

It is for these reasons that I strongly support these two policies.

I also think that "allotments" needs to be specifically included in the list of green spaces in the definition of "green and blue infrastructure" in para 4.6.31 of the draft plan (page 116)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2118</th>
<th>Respondent: 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure.
We greatly welcome this vastly-improved policy over that in the previous document. We have several suggestions for improvements to the supporting text around the policy, as below (indicated in red);

4.6.31 Introduction. ...The diversity of potential uses means that by planning for adequate retention and provision of green and blue infrastructure we can make a significant contribution to wellbeing and sustainability across the social, environmental and economic dimensions.

4.6.33 A positive approach to the adequate supply and maintenance of Green Infrastructure is crucial to the maintenance, protection and enhancement of biodiversity and wildlife in the borough, not least through the potential for creation provision of new habitats and by serving to provide connections between existing habitats. It can further assist in adaptation to climate change by providing pathways for species dispersal and migration; climate amelioration through providing the cooling effects of tree cover; and in natural management of fluvial flooding, for example, through floodplain re-connection and restoration, provision, connectivity which can also result in and the creation of new wetland habitats.

4.6.34 The Surrey Nature Partnership (SyNP) is the designated Local Nature Partnership for Surrey mandated by Government. SyNP is working with Surrey local authorities to set out an approach to conserving and enhancing the biodiversity of the county at a landscape scale. This approach identifies Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) as areas where there are concentrations of recognised sites of biodiversity importance, both statutory and non-statutory. a particular type of habitat. BOAs represent areas where improved habitat management and efforts to restore and re-create priority habitats will be most effective in improving connectivity and reducing habitat fragmentation. BOAs extend across local authority boundaries and therefore provide a strategic approach that addresses biodiversity at a landscape scale. In fact, the majority of the Guildford’s countryside within the borough of falls within BOAs (see figure 1), which is broadly indicative of just how rich in wildlife the borough is.

Blue infrastructure

4.6.39 The River Wey Navigation is a highly valued asset of borough wide significance, both as an important element of our borough’s biodiversity and as a very significant public space The National Trust has compiled a set of guidelines for what it considers are important characteristics of the river, and how this should be managed. These include the importance of the river as a ‘visually important open corridor’ and ‘an important leisure asset’ as well as a Conservation Area.

4.6.40 The EU Water Framework Directive 2000 aims for achievement of ‘good status’ for all ground and surface waters in the EU, initially by 2015 but by 2027 at the latest. This is assessed against a set of standards including water quality (both its chemistry and biology) and river morphology (for example, preserving or restoration to a naturally meandering course, having natural river banks as habitat) and re-connecting rivers to their floodplains; and providing backwater ponds). Much of the River Wey in the borough currently achieves ‘moderate status’, with some tributaries achieving only ‘poor’ or ‘bad’. The River Wey directly upstream from the borough is largely ‘poor’. The River Blackwater also largely achieves ‘moderate status’, but is a tributary of and thus within the neighbouring River Loddon catchment. This is considered a strategic issue due to the cross boundary nature of the impacts, and the importance of our waterways for the ecological health of the borough. Significant pressures on the River Wey include pollution from waste water and deriving from agricultural inputs, as well as from various sources in towns and from transport infrastructure; and the constraints to its natural function imposed by historic physical modifications to the river.

4.6.41 Both the River Wey and the River Blackwater, in combination with their floodplains and tributaries, are identified as BOAs.

Within Policy 14 itself; Blue infrastructure. Waterways will be protected and enhanced. Development proposals that are likely to have an impact on waterways (including across their catchments), must demonstrate how they will support the achievement of the Water Framework Directive and have followed guidance from the Environment Agency and Natural England on implementation of the Wey Catchment Management Plan and flood risk management.

Definitions

4.6.42 Net gains in biodiversity means biodiversity creation and/or enhancement. This should be integrated into the design of the site through the provision of new wildlife habitats, but also…
Certain of these suggested insertions and corrections would also need to be carried through to the Green & Blue Infrastructure Topic Paper.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/287  Respondent: 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy ID4: Green and Blue infrastructure. 4.6.34 “This approach identifies Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) as areas where there are concentrations of recognised..” (suggest insertion to aid clarity here)

Policy ID4: “Proposals for development must demonstrate how they will deliver appropriate net gains in biodiversity where possible.” Our only concern here is over where the arbitration of ‘possibility’ would ultimately lie. This is perhaps better clarified later on as resting wholly with yourselves (and essentially not with a developer or their advisers/consultants). We trust the Borough will be equipped with the specialist knowledge to implement this and look forward to working with you as and when required on such matters.

4.6.50 “The NPPF requires… through a Green & Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document once enough detail has emerged.” (suggest insertion here for consistency if appropriate). The Trust welcomes this intended SPD and we look forward to working with you on its development.

Monitoring Indicators: Net gains in biodiversity provided by development on sites of 25 homes or greater. This appears a reasonable enough approach; perhaps the derivation of this threshold requires some further clarification however.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Policy ID4: Green and Blue infrastructure. 4.6.34 “This approach identifies Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) as areas where there are concentrations of recognised..” (suggest insertion to aid clarity here).

Policy ID4: “Proposals for development must demonstrate how they will deliver appropriate net gains in biodiversity where possible.” Our only concern here is over where the arbitration of ‘possibility’ would ultimately lie. This is perhaps better clarified later on as resting wholly with yourselves (and essentially not with a developer or their advisers/consultants). We trust the Borough will be equipped with the specialist knowledge to implement this and look forward to working with you as and when required on such matters.

4.6.50 “The NPPF requires… through a Green & Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document once enough detail has emerged.” (suggest insertion here for consistency if appropriate). The Trust welcomes this intended SPD and we look forward to working with you on its development.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1254  Respondent: 8591169 / Michael Bruton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

f. I object to the failure in the Plan to consider the impact of excessive housing numbers on Special Protection Areas, SSSIs, Conservation areas and Guildford’s heritage assets
g. I object to the housing densities proposed for the major strategic sites – which are higher than many inner London Boroughs.

h. I object to the failure in the Local Plan to consider in any detail the impact of poor air quality on many of the proposed developments. In parts of the Borough, emissions exceed EU standards already band are in breach of the Air Quality Directive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11854  Respondent: 8595649 / Paul Kassell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no protection against garden grabbing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1642  Respondent: 8597761 / Mrs Pippa Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

20. I object to the inadequate protection of the environment.

21. I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the harm that will be caused to the Special Protection Area, the Sites of Special Scientific Interest and the borough's Conservation Area and heritage assets.

22. I object to the impact of poor air quality on the Special Protection Area.

23. I object to the erosion of the Green Belt in clear contravention of the Government's and Conservative councillors' election manifesto promises to protect the Green Belt. In particular, I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt (Policy P2) as Send provides a buffer between Woking and Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1155  Respondent: 8603201 / Guildford Allotments Society (Andrew Simmonds)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Response to Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan
This response is on behalf of Guildford Allotments Society, who manage approximately 650 allotment plots within Guildford town, all of them on land leased to us by GBC. There are two issues that concern us.

Firstly, the Local Plan involves building 13,860 homes within the borough by 2033, two thirds of which will be on sites at Ash/Tongham, Blackwell Farm (on the Hogs Back); Gosden Hill Farm, and Wisley airfield. The remainder appear to be smaller developments within Guildford town and the surrounding villages. Yet the plan makes no mention of a need for allotments, nor whether there is a requirement for additional sites. I believe that there is, and that this is a notable omission of the Local Plan. Indeed, GBC has a responsibility under S23 of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1908 to provide sufficient allotment plots if there is a demand. We believe that this omission of allotments from the Local Plan is a substantial oversight.

Attached as attachment 1 is our reasoning as to why around 140 additional allotment plots, within some 4.4 hectares in total, should be provided on several new sites within the Borough to ensure that the number of plots is broadly sufficient when these additional houses are built. The sites need to broadly be in the right locations, close to where the tenants live, to comply with your planning policies.

Secondly, our site at Bellfields. It has been suggested that part of this site, along with the neighbouring waste water treatment works, should become a housing development. Yet this does not feature in the plan. I therefore assume that it is beyond the 2033 planning horizon, and I am therefore not discussing the issue further; but for reference, details are set out as attachment 2. Should that for any reason not be the case, there is an opportunity for undertaking a strategic review of our allotment sites and their sizes to ensure that they provide the plots required to meet the demand, in areas accessible to tenants and complying with the policies laid out in the Local Plan. We recognise that there is a need to optimise the location of the additional houses and allotment sites.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to develop these issues further.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Simmonds

Attachment 1

Issue 1 - Reasoning in support of the additional allotment provision.

Current allotment provision within the Borough is roughly 1 plot for every 100 homes. Currently there are 137 on the waiting list, so arguably the current provision is inadequate; although the waiting list tends to fluctuate between 50 and 250. What is certain is that we are not over-provided for; but this is not an exact science.

The current waiting list is weighted towards Burpham, Merrow and the eastern town centre, and the Westborough / Rydes Hill area. However, we believe that there is no reasonable site available or likely to become available within these areas. Park Barn and Westborough have a higher proportion of allotment holders than the average; our sites at Farnham Road and Aldershot Road (Westborough Allotments) are full, and a number of other tenants resident in these areas are accommodated at Bellfields, our largest site.

With 13,860 additional homes, it seems reasonable to suggest that an additional 140 plots should be made available. In terms of land space, 40 plots require 1.25 hectares (to allow for access paths between plots, storage facilities for equipment, and sheds along the boundaries). Thus 140 plots = 4.4 hectares.

To comply with the policies within the plan; five stand out as being relevant. These are: policies D1 (Making Better Places), D2 (Sustainable Design), I1 (Infrastructure & Delivery), I3 (Sustainable Transport) and I4 (Green and Blue Infrastructure). Together, these infer that the four major development sites should each have their own dedicated allotment spaces within the curtilage of the development — say about 100 plots in all, or about 3.15 hectares in total — and that the remaining additional plots — about 40, or 1.25 hectares — should be identified within the town and surrounding villages broadly relative to the developments. The most important aspect is that the plots need to be on a secure site, readily accessible from people’s homes.

There is a potential for additional demand - in that if the additional houses have small gardens, they will not be large enough for people to grow their own, and hence likely that more residents will want allotments. So maybe the suggested demand above is inadequate.
I do not expect this Society to manage all of these sites; those at Ash/Tongham, and at Wisley, are outside of the area we currently serve; although there is no reason why we should not if it were felt appropriate.

A site at Blackwell Farm would prove popular, both for the new residents there and the additional demand from Park Barn / Westborough. Similarly, a site within the Gosden Hill development would be welcomed; both these sites need to be sized to match the local demand, taking into account current local unmet demand.

**Legal References**

Small Holdings and Allotments Act 1908

Relevant Sections:

S23 – Duty of councils to provide allotments
S25 Acquisition of land for purpose of Act
S26 Improvement and adaptation of land for allotments

**Attachment 2**

Issue 2 - The Bellfields site.

This site is currently the largest we operate, with 109 tenants. Should this site be proposed for housing development, or indeed any other development, the future we believe can comprise of three groups, each roughly a third of the total.

The first third are relatively elderly and live locally, and we believe that this situation will be ongoing. We would wish to retain around a third of the current area in that location, at Bellfields.

A second third live further away, primarily in the Stoughton / Rydes Hill / Westborough areas. There is scope to develop further land at the Aldershot Road (Westborough Allotments) site which is currently unused and outside of our current lease from GBC, which could simply relocate these tenants at Bellfields to be closer to their homes; this potential land swap would involve around a third of the current Bellfields site.

The final third need reprovision elsewhere; ideally close to Stoke Park as being the best area for where our tenants live, although we cannot identify a suitable site for allotment use. An area of Burpham Court Farm has been suggested as a potential swap for this final third. Whilst not rejecting the idea, it is not the optimal location in that it is not near to people’s homes; it is not accessible by public transport; and it is adjoining and would have access via a busy road that will become busier if/when the link road from Slyfield is built. The Gosden Hill development is likely to further add traffic to the area, and to Burpham itself. The Burpham Court Farm site simply does not meet the policies set out in the Local Plan, and our preference would thus be to not move these tenants from the Bellfields site.

Thus in conclusion, unless another site more local to Stoke Park can be identified, our preference would be to retain around two thirds of the current site at Bellfields, with the other third being released upon development of the unused land at the Aldershot Road (Westborough Allotments) site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1045</th>
<th>Respondent: 8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>WBDRA SUPPORTS this policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Making the other part of Riverside Nature Reserve a SANG will not provide any new land to recreation for the 28,000+ new residents.

Guildford is in desperate need of a local plan but this is unsound and will not deliver.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

We note and support the following policies in the Plan:

Policy I4 Green and Blue infrastructure

7.5.1 We welcome GBC’s recognition of the importance of preserving and enhancing green spaces and stretches of open water, and looks forward to the Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document (“SPD”)

In that context we would encourage GBC to incorporate within the Local Plan the proposal by parish residents, working with Surrey Wildlife, to develop the Stonebridge site as a Wildlife Refuge.

7.5.2 We welcome the aspect of the Policy with regard to Open Space and note the inclusion of Shalford as having a “shortfall of park and rec (public combined), children’s play space and youth provision” (page 81) in the Guildford Open Space, Sports and Recreation Assessment 2016-2033 prepared by Ethos Environmental Planning in June 2016.

7.5.3 We further note in the Assessment of Sites of Amenity Value produced by Ethos Environmental Planning in May 2016 that, on page 118, the land to the south of the Village Hall was identified as a site of High Amenity Value GIS ETH_088 and that “the site is in an elevated position and offers aesthetic value”. It should be noted that the site could be accessible to the public with a public footpath on the western boundary and the public village hall to the north.

7.5.4 The Policies Map for Shalford (south) on page 364 of the Plan now clearly identifies the site as Open Space which under NPPF paragraph 74 means that it “should not be built on except in specified circumstances”. We welcome this protection if it is determined ultimately that the land falls within the proposed revised settlement boundary for Shalford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10098  Respondent: 8640353 / Julian Cranwell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Response type: OBJECT

The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which is welcome. We also note and welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. However the current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will have the opposite effect. The Policy appears therefore to be a box-ticking exercise with no real teeth to it.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

“The natural world, its biodiversity and its constituent ecosystems are critically important to our wellbeing and economic prosperity, but are consistently undervalued in conventional economic analyses and decision-making” (Biodiversity 2020 page 11)

“As a public authority in England you have a duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of your policy or decision making.” (Government Planning Guidance)

Part of the problem is that “Biodiversity benefits are unpriced” and so not valued by those who look only at the more obvious and simplistic economic benefits.

We have some concerns that “enhancing” the River Wey in the town centre will avoid using the available brownfield land around Walnut Tree Close and Slyfield for urban regeneration and sustainable housing that could otherwise be used.

The policy on Green and Blue infrastructure is broadly supported with an important and major caveat; and if disregarded this should count as an objection.

However, it is noted that the largest areas of industrial brownfield land within the borough are near to or adjacent to the River Wey, particularly in the Walnut Tree Close area and in the Slyfield industrial area.

These areas could support much more housing than the relatively small numbers indicated in the policy on the town centre, under a town centre regeneration scheme. This would have huge benefits for the community as a whole since relatively run down areas would be subject to regeneration, the river banks would be cleaner and more attractive.

It is vitally important for the town as a whole that the run-down Walnut Tree Close area is used for well-designed housing, as indicated by the Mastervision document first draft compiled by Allies and Morrison. John Rigg of Savills and Guildford Vision Group indicated to the Scrutiny Committee of GBC that initial commercial projections indicated that the Walnut Tree Close area alone could provide 4000 homes. This is significantly in excess of the current GBC proposals. Both Allies & Morrison and GVG initially indicated that they believed that this site could be available for regeneration within the critical 5 year window required for the local plan. It is therefore essential that nothing in this policy should jeopardise anything that could lead to the Walnut Tree Close area being a regeneration zone.

As has been noted elsewhere, for reasons that are not altogether clear but appear to be connected to central government direction and a desire to maximize the Community Infrastructure Levy, there is an aggressive desire to push development
on to the Green Belt at all costs, ignoring or eliminating for other reasons sites which could be used in the town for residential purposes. This has informed recent planning decisions (both the Aldi site and the Waitrose site were originally zoned for residential purposes and were eminently suitable for this) and this bias seems to be informing the Local Plan.

As a result, it is important that the desire for Green and Blue infrastructure does not become an excuse for preventing regeneration of Walnut Tree Close. It is noted that the Council has stated that “The Council is keen to protect the watercourses from inappropriate development that would spoil their character”. The bus station adjacent to the River Wey, and the empty car parks associated with empty factory space, are hardly attractive development – well designed mid height (3-4 storey) apartment blocks would be a great improvement to the river corridor, offer major scope for sustainable regeneration, and would prevent the need for any incursion into the Green Belt to meet reasonable housing needs.

That regeneration zone would be highly sustainable, because it would be within 1 mile of the railway station, adjacent to the A3, and would eliminate an area of huge congestion in the town because if the industrial sites were replaced by housing then the residents would commute by train or walk to work rather than having to drive in to an industrial estate.

It certainly does not seem appropriate to create substantial new parkland on current hard standing. The protections to which this policy refers largely describe existing open space, which is of great importance. But to determine not to utilize brownfield land for residential use at an appropriate density in order to force building on to the Green Belt would seem to be in contradiction of the principles of use of the Green Belt applied in the Gallaher Homes v Solihull court of appeal case, where the hierarchy of use is clearly defined, with urban brownfield required to be used as a first option.

So there is some considerable support for the residential element of this policy, with the note that this should be explicitly amended to permit construction of a regeneration zone on the brownfield areas surrounding the river in the middle of the town, and that this should not be held up pending yet more transport studies (Guildford’s track record on brownfield utilisation is poor), but should be implemented with immediate effect.

It is not clear what form the “parkland” along the River Wey will take but the images available in the Town Centre MasterPlan suggest mown grass similar to the area around Millmead. This misses an opportunity to enhance biodiversity and enable town centre residents to engage with wildlife. Engagement with wildlife should mean much more than throwing bread at ducks and chasing pigeons. To achieve a wildlife corridor through Guildford, that can also benefit the health and well-being of residents living close by, the green space retained beside the river should be managed with the needs of wildlife in mind.

Responses to policy notes:

4.6.33 Villages are generally permeable to wildlife. The lower density of housing and presence of gardens (especially larger gardens) provides a corridor for movement across the residential area. Insetting of villages and the relaxation of planning restrictions in the Green Belt implied by Policy P2 will lead to infilling, “garden grabbing” and consequent loss of biodiversity. It will replace connections and corridors between habitats with barriers and lead to further fragmentation of our natural infrastructure.

4.6.34 In the past Guildford Borough Council recognised the role that wildlife gardening and management of parks and open spaces for wildlife could play in enhancing biodiversity. There seems to have been a shift away from this. These aspects should be recognised in the Plan as well as the importance of BOAs and although 4.6.35 goes part way towards this we have yet to see the GISPD.

4.6.36 This is long overdue and should include the way that our lanes are managed. The current approach is unsympathetic, sometimes damaging tree roots and scarce native plants. It seems to be oriented towards encouraging faster traffic rather than recognising the traffic-calming effects of natural vegetation (See the original Quiet Lanes Initiative) – management of open spaces and lanes

We await the Countryside Vision with interest.

4.6.37 It appears that Policy I5 has been omitted,(We think this meansP5 – more evidence of slapdash work)

4.6.38 We agree with this statement but public access is frequently damaging to biodiversity – the more obvious examples being dogs out of control in the vicinity of ground-nesting birds and trampling of grassland habitats. Public open space must be protected for the reasons given but wildlife needs undisturbed (or at least less disturbed) space too if it is to thrive.

Responses to definitions:
This section starts with a definition that is not a proper definition and is followed by statements that are not definitions at all, apart from the last – suggesting that this part of the document has not been thought through or checked.

4.6.42 “Biodiversity creation and/or enhancement” is not a definition – it requires definition.

Do you mean that you will create new species or encourage them to evolve? Or do you mean that you will increase the number of species living in the Borough, or the population of each species, or both?

The points made are aspirational that have no enforcement to back them.

We support the use of green roofs and walls.

However, building on the countryside and increasing the population by such a large amount will not help vulnerable species. It will put added pressure on remaining habitats and increase light and air pollution, degrading the ability of the borough to support wildlife.

4.6.43 Arrangements with developers have no guarantee of success or longevity. They involve partial mitigation and overall loss of the original biodiversity interest of a site.

4.6.44 This appears to be saying that you will deliberately put playing fields, sports facilities and other leisure activities in BOAs – but these are land uses that reduce biodiversity!

4.6.45 Our understanding of SANG is that it is intended to reduce pressure on Special Protection Areas by providing an alternative area for people to walk their dogs – and hope that they do not prefer to use the SPA. In other words they are intended to attract the type of user that is damaging to vulnerable species such as ground-nesting birds. In the desperation to find SANG land Guildford Borough Council are making use of existing open space that will not attract people away from the SPA and you are ignoring the impact on existing wildlife. For example – GBC decided to include the towpath in the Parsonage Meadows SANG as a way of also facilitating a cycle route. Encouraging cyclists and dog-walkers to use the same narrow path will not encourage dog-walkers to use it rather than the SPA. At Effingham Common GBC plan to designate an important area for wildlife and ground-nesting Skylarks. GBC is riding roughshod over the opinions of the Commoners and local residents. GBC used to put up signage warning dog-walkers not to disturb the Skylarks during the nesting season – but these signs were not put up until well into the nesting season this year and only then after complaints and harassment of Skylarks by out-of-control dogs.

In allocating sites as SANG, GBC has ignored the requirement to consider existing biodiversity and clearly have little or any knowledge or understanding of the issue. The issues relating to Russell Place Farm have been pointed out by a qualified Biologist (see article in The Guildford Dragon by Chris Venables, Many invertebrates are dependent on the dung of grazing animals and this aspect of our countryside is being steadily driven out of our Borough).

4.6.46 We welcome this acknowledgement of the damaging effects of the proposed building developments. This also has relevance to the manner in which the green spaces next to the River Wey are managed.

4.6.47 We welcome the proposals but are concerned that these may be no more than good intentions. How will GBC ensure that they are carried out fully – and paid for by the developer?

Reasoned Justification:

4.6.50 As the emerging strategy for Surrey and the GISP are not yet available the plan should not be proposing sites that will jeopardise them. The implication is that this aspect of the plan is not being taken seriously and will carry no weight in site selection despite the guidance in the NPPF.

4.6.51 In fact some GBC contract mowing and lane management is not in line with a strategy that is meant to protect biodiversity. Examples – damage to tree roots and unsympathetic treatment of roadside vegetation (that includes orchid species) in Chalk Lane – southern end of Kingston Meadow in East Horsley is now mown flat rather than left to grow as a meadow through the Spring and Summer as it used to be (so no more day-flying Burnet moths).

KEY EVIDENCE

Guildford Borough Policy Statements are statements – not evidence.

Additional evidence should include:
Existing SNCI surveys, including those that took place in 2004-2007.

Biodiversity evidence emerging from Neighbourhood Plans.

Evidence obtained by requests to local naturalists and natural history societies including those with a specialist interest.

**MONITORING**

Simply maintaining open space will not be enough for a significantly enlarged population.

Providing more open space to meet existing shortfalls or the needs of a much larger population will reduce the area of land currently in food production or providing wildlife habitat.

SANG delivery is harming existing biodiversity

It is not clear how you will measure a change in biodiversity just by looking at planning applications. “Net gains in biodiversity provided by development” is a contradiction in terms. There may well be a few examples in England where low density housing has been combined with manufactured habitat at the expense of loss of agricultural land with no surrounding habitat damage - but we see no evidence of that in the Local Plan. Even when a housing development replaces agricultural land it increases pressure on the surrounding countryside. A simple example is where houses border woodland and residents dump their garden rubbish (and often worse) over the garden fence. Increased leisure use on nearby countryside also has an adverse effect on biodiversity.

There is no guarantee that mitigations listed in an application will be carried out and their effectiveness is not guaranteed either. GBC would need to carry out follow-up ecological surveys on all sites. Who would pay for these? Are there enough consultants to carry out the work in sufficient detail? What aspects of biodiversity will be measured?

How frequently are surveys by Natural England intended to take place? How will GBC ensure that NE carry them out? A baseline of existing surveys against which changes will be monitored should be included within the plan and it must be comprehensive for monitoring to be effective.

How frequently will SNCI surveys be carried out? At what expense? The last survey published in 2007 made recommendations for an increase in the size of the Wisley Airfield SNCI and stated that this should be taken into account for planning purposes. This was overridden in the recent planning inspector’s report and the Local Plan includes this particular SNCI as a building site. This is clearly a case of hypocrisy and suggests that the Council has no genuine intention to maintain biodiversity let alone enhance it.

We believe that a survey of SNCIs is currently taking place but that it is limited in scope to the previously known sites. This prevents other sites, where genuine biodiversity enhancement has taken place (often as a result of volunteer community effort), from being recognised in this way. While every stone is being turned over in the quest to find green space to build on, no genuine effort is being made to identify biodiversity hotspots that may have been overlooked in the past. In other words the approach being taken is one that intends to make no net gain, and possibly even reduce, sites of nature conservation interest – in contradiction to the stated aims.

If an existing SNCI (or one proposed on grounds of biodiversity but not formally accepted in a Local Plan) is found to be in poor condition the action taken should be to bring it back into good condition – not to remove its status and build on it.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
We object to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that:

1.1.1 It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;

1.1.2 The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;

1.1.3 Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;

1.1.4 Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.

1.1.5 The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1818  Respondent: 8659489 / Helen Bennett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? (Yes), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Everything that can be done to conserve natural green landscapes, be they woodland, hedges, commons, heaths, agricultural land or parks and gardens should be done. We are the custodians of the landscape and the biodiversity that depends on us for its survival. It should be our pleasure and our duty to offer protection to our wildlife and its habitats. The maintenance of clean, lifeful water courses is essential. the blue and green infrastructure should be kept as wild as possible, not turned into playing fields and mown dog walking areas. The open green landscape is not there just to be tamed by us but as a living habitat, which still gives enormous pleasure to those who wish to walk in it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2325  Respondent: 8671969 / Valerie Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

14 Green and Blue infrastructure

I object to the idea that biodiversity can be extended if the rest of the countryside is covered with houses.

No mention is made of large gardens or the benefits of hedgerows and natural strips beside fields, or of the impact of removing farmland for building or SANGs on food production.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1550  Respondent: 8687041 / Michael Aaronson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that, while this Policy claims "Permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity", this is manifestly contradicted by other Policies, in particular the inclusion in the Plan of Policy/Site A46. If this site is developed as per the Plan, i.e. if 1100 new houses are built on it, it will completely destroy a precious wildlife habitat that is home to an extraordinary variety of flora and fauna, as evidenced by the separate submission from the Friends of Normandy Wildlife. And all this on the spurious grounds that building 1100 houses 'enables' the development of a new secondary school, the need for which has not been established. The same comments apply to the proposed Policy/Site A47, which is a SNCI - how can anyone justify building 50 houses on such a site? Thus this Policy clearly is not strong enough to achieve the objectives it sets itself.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1090  Respondent: 8687265 / Dagero Ltd (David Roberts)  Agent:

POLICY I4 Green and blue infrastructure

I OBJECT. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2642  Respondent: 8693153 / Vicki Willetts  Agent:

I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE): • No teeth. Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11504  Respondent: 8706625 / Hilary Barker  Agent:

I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE): • No teeth. Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Russell Place Farm - Wood Street Village SANG</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This site is not needed as a SANG as it is adjacent to 128 hectares of Common Land – Broad Street and Backside Commons offer the residents and visitors enough varied recreational space in the village – walkers, dog walkers, horse riding, bicycling and running.

Natural England’s report NECR136 para 3.58 dated 13th February 2014 indicates that there is no evidence to suggest provision of a SANG reduces the number of visitors to the SPA. Contrary to the NPPF para 118.

- This land is within the Metropolitan Green Belt so this would be “inappropriate” development.

There is already a public footpath 377 across this land providing for dog walking facilities.

- This is viable working farm land. Agricultural land should be protected for the future needs of a growing population in the SE.
- This expanse of farm land is a very attractive feature in Frog Grove Lane and the plans put forward will turn it into a contrived, sculptured space with unnatural footpaths creating an “urban” character compared to the “natural” character of the established Commons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Broad Street Common and Backside Common SANG</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Common Land is given to the people for their recreation and enjoyment of natural spaces and environments and are already publicly available land where residents have the right to walk over the commons via s193 of the Law of Property Act 1925 and the CROW Act (Countryside and Rights of Way) 2000.

Natural England’s report NECR136 para 3.58 dated 13th February 2014 indicates that there is no evidence to suggest provision of a SANG reduces the number of visitors to the SPA. Contrary to the NPPF para 118.

It is therefore inappropriate to designate the COMMONS as SANGS as it DOES NOT provide any new additional recreational space.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4741  **Respondent:** 8711841 / Rosmarie Roberts-Kunz  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):**

- A toothless policy completely cancelled out by plan for huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11649  **Respondent:** 8721857 / Andrea Lightfoot  **Agent:**

---

Section page number  
Page 25 of 146  
Document page number  
2065
The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land, or biodiversity of gardens that will be built on if gardens are inset.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to POLICY I4 Green and blue infrastructure

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
- No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.
- All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

The intention to increase the size of village boundaries, thereby allowing developers to propose even more sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object

Policy has no teeth and appears to contradict much of the rest of this plan.

We welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity opportunity areas; however the current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will have the opposite effect. That includes the flawed approach of making farmland into SANGS. There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

The inset map for Wood Street Village is incorrect as it does not show the common land on Oak Hill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/2070  Respondent: 8729217 / Karen Stevens  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Green infrastructure

I support the addition of the statement in para 4.6.42a that: “Where proposals fall within or adjacent to a BOA [Biodiversity Opportunity Area], biodiversity measures should support the BOA’s objectives, including those set out in the BOA Policy Statements produced by SyNP [Surrey Nature Partnership].” However, it has not been explained how the Local Plan meets this requirement. The Blackwell Farm (A26) allocation has habitats and Species of Principal Importance for the Conservation of Biodiversity. It is located adjacent to a BOA, and arguably should have been included within it. Bizarrely, all the farmland along the northern slopes of the Hogs Back has been included with the BOA, except for that in the ownership of the University of Surrey. This begs the question: why has Surrey Nature Partnership omitted this land from this BOA, when it forms the same habitat and has the same biodiversity value as adjacent land included within it? This omission would appear to be deliberate, in the same way that SCC has not been able to demonstrate (despite FOI requests) that it carried out landscape character assessments for land on Blackwell Farm (as part of the AONB boundary review).

It is a policy of the NPPF to “Allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework”, and it is a strategic priority of Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for England’s Wildlife and Ecosystem Services to “take a strategic approach to planning for nature within and across local areas” as “This approach will guide development to the best locations” in the context of reducing environmental pressures. It has not been explained how the Local Plan has used Surrey Nature Partnership’s identification of Biodiversity Opportunity Areas to guide developments to the best location.

Blue infrastructure

I object to the changes in policy ID4, which fail to take into account the environmental impacts on the River Wey of developing the Blackwell Farm site and other strategic sites.

GBC has been tasked with the specific action in the River Basin Management Plan that, when developing new DPDs and when making planning decisions, the planning authority should use evidence relating to “priority water bodies” (those that have been assigned “bad”/“poor” status, such as the River Wey), alongside other relevant evidence, to influence the location and scale of future development[12]. There is no indication in the Plan of how GBC has fulfilled this requirement. The River Wey is already failing the Water Framework Directive for phosphates and Natural England states that the majority of phosphates in rivers comes from treated/untreated sewerage. The current Plan will only make this matter worse.
Blackwell Farm remains home to a number of birds of Principal Importance for the Conservation of Biodiversity, despite the recent use of bird scarers on the University-owned farmland.

More than a half of Blackwell Farm sits above the 90m contour (orange) and includes C18 parkland (light blue), ancient woodland and Grade 2 farmland (dark blue/green). The farmland in yellow is criss crossed with ancient hedgerows and provides a habitat for ground nesting birds.


**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:** [KJS 2017 consultation response (rev 01F).pdf](#) (7.6 MB)
and AGLV status and that they were outside the settlement boundary would afford the requisite protection against development.

We have been informed that the intention is to designate the fields as “Open Space” however there is no definition of what this means and therefore it is impossible to consult on something where the consequences are unknown.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1145  Respondent: 8776417 / Nici Holland  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. We live in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and as such, any developments should be carefully considered and alternatives taken where possible. Rather than building upon a new site, Guildford town could usefully be regenerated with 4-5 storey blocks with landscaping and underground parking. I understand that new homes are needed for University students but Surrey University, has failed to use its existing planning consents (dating from 2004) to accommodate 3,000 students or development its campus (e.g. build on its extensive and underused car parks). If students were accommodated in this way, 2,000 homes would be freed up in town Building more homes in Guildford cannot make houses more affordable, given the proximity of the London market.

2. Local people should be consulted and not ignored. Villages need protecting in terms of both design and scale.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17464  Respondent: 8793281 / Robert Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Question…With the proposed large housing developments such as Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill, Wisley, Normandy, will they include on site recreational open green space in the planning applications. Meaning no further SANG would be required in respect of large developments. Will this also apply to any development of 25 homes more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5628  Respondent: 8795649 / G Pask  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously - air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1478  Respondent: 8796481 / Sally Erhardt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of environmental and ecological safeguarding. Not enough thought has been given to protect the SPA, SSSI AND SNCI. Air quality concerns should be greater. The air quality is already poor.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4106  Respondent: 8805249 / Peter Warburton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.
2. I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12132  Respondent: 8812833 / Simon P Hill  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to any "in-setting" (i.e. removal) of any villages from the protection of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4309  Respondent: 8824065 / Robin Hubbard  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
The proposal for ‘open space’ in the current version of the plan does not retain the same long term protection as if the fields were left as they are (based on opinion I have had from planners and lawyers), both outside the settlement boundary and within the green belt. We know that developers have already been working on a plan to develop the land, so I therefore challenge why the council would then make the above proposed changes as this would then result in this precious land losing its protection and being open for development?

While I appreciate the Council are, by this classification of ‘open space’, acknowledging that this land is of unusual significance to the entire village, but nobody in the village has yet to receive a meaningful planning or legal explanation as to why or how ‘open space’ could possibly be a better classification. I suspect this is because one doesn’t exist! I am therefore asking for your support in not making changes for the sake of it when the entire local community are united behind their desire to keep this attractive and open land protected, and the settlement and green belt boundaries left as they are in relation to these fields.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Paras 2.20 and 2.21 sound very reasonable “… to look to a controlled realignment of the Green Belt boundary and development of a small number of strategic sites to allow us to provide for mixed and inclusive communities supported by new infrastructure” until one looks at what you are actually proposing for Worplesdon – strategic developments, which include a 71% increase in housing, a care home, a cemetery, a park and ride, a secondary school and community football ground and a great many traveller sites. All this in just one parish.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

1. Site 109. Blackwell Farm. SANG

Blackwell Farm is a working farm. It is good quality agricultural land. With the proposed increase in population in the South East there will be greater pressure on food resources so we need to protect our ability to provide food and crops for this country in the coming years.

The land is ancient woodland and should not be disturbed.

The land abuts Broadstreet and Backside Common and therefore is an inappropriate and unnecessary place to site a SANG. We do not want artificially contrived SANGs when we already have natural common land nearby.

The public already has access to this land because of existing footpaths and bridleways.

1. Site 110. Broadstreet and Backside Common. SANG

Commons are already publicly available land. The public have the right to walk over the commons via s193 of the Law of Property Act 1925 and the CROW Act (Country and Rights of Way) 2000. It is, therefore, inappropriate to designate the commons as SANG as it does NOT provide any new additional recreational space.

We do not want artificially contrived SANGs when we already have natural common land.

Natural England’s report NECR136 para 3.58 dated 13 February 2014, indicates that there is no evidence to suggest provision of a SANG reduces the number of visitors to the SPA. Contrary to the NPPF – para 118.

Rather than providing numerous SANG sites, policy constraints should be applied to the SHMA – the figure of 652 houses per year needs to be reduced in recognition of the planning constraints in Guildford (Green Belt, SPA, SSSI, SNCI, infrastructure deficiencies)

1. Site 112. Russell Place Farm.

This land is good quality agricultural land. It is currently used for grazing cattle. With the proposed increase in population in the South East there is greater pressure on food resources so we need to protect our ability to provide food and crops for this country.
The land abuts Broadstreet and Backside Common and therefore is an inappropriate and unnecessary place to site a SANG. We do not want artificially contrived SANGs when we already have natural common land nearby.

The public already has access to this field because of existing footpaths.

Rather than providing numerous SANG sites policy constraints should be applied to the SHMA – the figure of 652 houses per year needs to be reduced in recognition of the planning constraints in Guildford (Green Belt, SPA, SSSI, SNCl, infrastructure deficiencies)

1. Site 113. Stringers Common. SANG

Commons are already publicly available land. Residents have the right to walk over the commons via s193 of the Law of Property Act 1925 and the CROW Act (Countryside and Rights of Way) 2000. It is, therefore, inappropriate to designate the commons as SANG as it does NOT provide any new additional recreational space.

We do not want artificially contrived SANGs when we already have natural common land.

Natural England’s report NECR136 para 3.58 dated 13 February 2014, indicates that there is no evidence to suggest provision of a SANG reduces the number of visitors to the SPA. Contrary to the NPPF – para 118.

Rather than providing numerous SANG sites policy constraints should be applied to the SHMA – the figure of 652 houses per year needs to be reduced in recognition of the planning constraints in Guildford (Green Belt, SPA, SSSI, SNCl, infrastructure deficiencies)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Object** to the impact it will have on a village that is positioned on the north side of the North Downs and partially within the Surrey Hills AONB and attracts a large number of recreational visitors throughout the year including walkers and cyclists. Within the village area are a number of important wildlife habitats that I believe should be preserved for future generations. Furthermore, I believe it will change the dark skies within the area affecting both wildlife and enjoyment of the night sky. Additionally, one of the proposed sites wraps around the local camping site, which welcomes visitors from around the world who use it as a base to visit Guildford, The Surrey Hills, RHS Wisley, Polesden Lacey, Hatchlands, Clandon, Hampton Court and day trips to London. Any proposed development on this site is likely to deter such tourism and cause further negative impact on the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14746  **Respondent:** 8831393 / John Dumbleton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This policy in particularly important to residents of Merrow who value the Green Belt on the approach from the East. Clandon Park, Merrow Downs and the SSSI in the quarry on the Clandon Golf site are equally important. These must be protected to preserve attractive, accessible countryside, retain the green character of the edge of Guildford and its approach roads, protect views throughout the borough and ensure that new developments contribute to creating distinctive places and a sense of community and provide well designed spaces for vehicles to reduce the dominance of parked cars on our streets.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16958  **Respondent:** 8831393 / John Dumbleton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**POLICY I 4: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE**

This policy in particularly important to residents of Merrow who value the Green Belt on the approach from the East. Clandon Park, Merrow Downs and the SSSI in the quarry on the Clandon Golf site are equally important. These must be protected to preserve attractive, accessible countryside, retain the green character of the edge of Guildford and its approach roads, protect views throughout the borough and ensure that new developments contribute to creating distinctive places and a sense of community and provide well designed spaces for vehicles to reduce the dominance of parked cars on our streets.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/13863  **Respondent:** 8835553 / David Pile  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
There is talk of only low grade agricultural land being used for building. This is a red herring. Low grade agricultural land is needed to maintain the biodiversity in the area. It is because of additional population pressures that Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces (SANGS) are begin proposed (although this appears to be a sop so that houses can be built). Their aim is to have fewer people in the existing Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area. This low grade agricultural land is needed as land; not as a housing estate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15783</th>
<th>Respondent: 8836129 / Roger Shapley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will not conserve or enhance biodiversity, nor extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. The Policy appears therefore to be a box-ticking exercise with no real teeth to it. There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16932</th>
<th>Respondent: 8837729 / Harry Clarke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Policy I4 – object**
   1. The Policy should provide support for Wildlife Corridors, such as those identified in the Effingham Neighbourhood Plan. The Policy should state that developments will not be permitted that will materially harm designated wildlife corridors.
   2. Para 4.6.45 – Evidence is that designation of a SANG, such as Effingham Common has resulted in the reduction in biodiversity. For example, there has been a noticeable decline in skylarks on the Common due to dog walkers not following designed footpaths and bridleways.
   3. Monitoring Indicators for Policy I4 – object due to inadequate measures.
      1. Surveys of key species groups are required to monitor protected sites, This is the only method to state whether biodiversity is increasing or decreasing over time. Minimum time frame for comparisons is ten years, as used by IUCN for Red Lists.
      2. Survey of abundance of indicator species on the protected sites. There are a number of key indicators used at the national level.

      • Number of new SANGS is not a measure of biodiversity, but a measure of permitted development within 5km of a SPA.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16233</th>
<th>Respondent: 8839041 / Jon Maslin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure.

This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY

I object to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that:

It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;

The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;

Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;

Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.

The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved.

GREEN BELT SITES

I object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan.

I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that ‘allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.’ This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are tired of repeating the same comments as it appears to be a waste of time and effort. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.13

All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until ‘exceptional circumstances’ for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9476  Respondent: 8840321 / Dorothy R Freeman  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The very idea of concreting over Green Belt land, which provides not only a habitat for wildlife and improves air quality, but helps to absorb the excess rainwater in flood-prone areas is inexcusable and would spoil the character of our villages entirely.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8185  Respondent: 8845121 / Sue Darling  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re Stated Objectives number 6, I object to the exclusion of ANSNGs (Accessible Natural and Semi Natural Greenspace) from the list of designated areas to be protected. Guildford BC is responsible for a number of these sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/681  Respondent: 8846529 / Vera Bulbeck  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• We need to maintain our wildlife, and we should be looking at ways of keeping the environment green and not being overloaded with property in areas of wild life This situation makes an even worse scenario for our drainage system, and could lead if more property is built, being all concrete, to the whole area being flooded. This is purely greed of squeezing people into confined spaces. However, what will happen to all the wildlife, you cannot expect deer to stay in the small woods that have been allocated for being woodland for animals. Changing the fields into a concrete jungle is not a welcome sight. Why are you even considering building on green belt land? When there are numerous other sites to be considered for example brown field sites and Wisely air field.

I would like you to consider the above planning application with the village of Normandy as a priority to maintaining a healthy environment to live in. I look forward to your comments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5346  Respondent: 8846849 / David Berliand  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously - air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village's green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1978  Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

4.6.45 I object to the reliance on SANGs. “The Council expects the delivery of new SANGs to make a very significant contribution to achieving the net gains in biodiversity required by the NPPF…” How can the Council simply “expect” this when there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166, and no explanation of how gains in biodiversity will be measured/monitored?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2308  Respondent: 8851905 / Jonathan Mitchell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

All SANGs should be created in consultation with Surrey Wildlife Trust and local conservation groups.

Proposed SANG 4 at Tyting Farm should be created and managed so as to maximise chalk downland flora and create a substantial portion of a green corridor linking Pewley Down and Newlands Corner. Special emphasis should be given to managing the habitat for the flagship Small Blue butterfly (Cupido mimimus), a UK BAP priority species.

Reference: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-surrey-24525303

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3096  Respondent: 8852289 / John F. Wood  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the air quality in the area being further polluted by the increased traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3098  Respondent: 8852289 / John F. Wood  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the loss of farming land, which with the enormous increase of global population, will become increasingly important.

I object to the loss of natural habitat for our local flora and fauna, which the Proposed Local Plan would put under siege.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

*Attached documents:*

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2842  **Respondent:** 8854977 / Susan Lukey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

3) Our garden backs onto the A323 and I am concerned about noise and pollution as my husband has COPD (and other neighbours have the same problems)

4) Our hospital cannot cope with anymore patients.

5) Sawgs are created on lovely natural beautiful land. I do not agree that they should be created so that building houses can get the go ahead. I am especially concerned about anything changing around the commons by Fairlands and Agricultural land in Wood St.

6) I do not want the status changed on the common by fairlands opposite gravetts lane. It is a beautiful habitat for skylarks and butterflies - just take a walk to it now!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

*Attached documents:*

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2531  **Respondent:** 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

very weak

more use of the river

more housing Debenhams should be converted to housing

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

*Attached documents:*

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/17794  **Respondent:** 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )
I OBJECT

The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which is welcome. I also note and welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. However the current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will have the opposite effect. The Policy appears therefore to be a box-ticking exercise with no real teeth to it.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

“The natural world, its biodiversity and its constituent ecosystems are critically important to our wellbeing and economic prosperity, but are consistently undervalued in conventional economic analyses and decision-making” (Biodiversity 2020 page 11)

“As a public authority in England you have a duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of your policy or decision making.” (Government Planning Guidance)

Part of the problem is that “Biodiversity benefits are unpriced” and so not valued by those who look only at the more obvious and simplistic economic benefits.

We have some concerns that “enhancing” the River Wey in the town centre will avoid using the available brownfield land around Walnut Tree Close and Slyfield for urban regeneration and sustainable housing that could otherwise be used.

The policy on Green and Blue infrastructure is broadly supported with an important and major caveat; and if disregarded this should count as an objection.

However, it is noted that the largest areas of industrial brownfield land within the borough are near to or adjacent to the River Wey, particularly in the Walnut Tree Close area and in the Slyfield industrial area.

These areas could support much more housing than the relatively small numbers indicated in the policy on the town centre, under a town centre regeneration scheme. This would have huge benefits for the community as a whole since relatively run down areas would be subject to regeneration, the river banks would be cleaner and more attractive.

It is vitally important for the town as a whole that the run-down Walnut Tree Close area is used for well-designed housing, as indicated by the Mastervision document first draft compiled by Allies and Morrison. John Rigg of Savills and Guildford Vision Group indicated to the Scrutiny Committee of GBC that initial commercial projections indicated that the Walnut Tree Close area alone could provide 4000 homes. This is significantly in excess of the current GBC proposals. Both Allies & Morrison and GVG initially indicated that they believed that this site could be available for regeneration within the critical 5 year window required for the local plan. It is therefore essential that nothing in this policy should jeopardise anything that could lead to the Walnut Tree Close area being a regeneration zone.

As has been noted elsewhere, for reasons that are not altogether clear but appear to be connected to central government direction and a desire to maximize the Community Infrastructure Levy, there is an aggressive desire to push development on to the Green Belt at all costs, ignoring or eliminating for other reasons sites which could be used in the town for residential purposes. This has informed recent planning decisions (both the Aldi site and the Waitrose site were originally zoned for residential purposes and were eminently suitable for this) and this bias seems to be informing the Local Plan.

As a result, it is important that the desire for Green and Blue infrastructure does not become an excuse for preventing regeneration of Walnut Tree Close. It is noted that the Council has stated that “The Council is keen to protect the watercourses from inappropriate development that would spoil their character”. The bus station adjacent to the River Wey, and the empty car parks associated with empty factory space, are hardly attractive development – well designed mid height (3-4 storey) apartment blocks would be a great improvement to the river corridor, offer major scope for sustainable regeneration, and would prevent the need for any incursion into the Green Belt to meet reasonable housing needs.

That regeneration zone would be highly sustainable, because it would be within 1 mile of the railway station, adjacent to the A3, and would eliminate an area of huge congestion in the town because if the industrial sites were replaced by housing then the residents would commute by train or walk to work rather than having to drive in to an industrial estate.
It certainly does not seem appropriate to create substantial new parkland on current hard standing. The protections to which this policy refers largely describe existing open space, which is of great importance. But to determine not to utilize brownfield land for residential use at an appropriate density in order to force building on to the Green Belt would seem to be in contradiction of the principles of use of the Green Belt applied in the Gallaher Homes v Solihull court of appeal case, where the hierarchy of use is clearly defined, with urban brownfield required to be used as a first option.

So there is some considerable support for the residential element of this policy, with the note that this should be explicitly amended to permit construction of a regeneration zone on the brownfield areas surrounding the river in the middle of the town, and that this should not be held up pending yet more transport studies (Guildford’s track record on brownfield utilisation is poor), but should be implemented with immediate effect.

It is not clear what form the “parkland” along the River Wey will take but the images available in the Town Centre MasterPlan suggest mown grass similar to the area around Millmead. This misses an opportunity to enhance biodiversity and enable town centre residents to engage with wildlife. Engagement with wildlife should mean much more than throwing bread at ducks and chasing pigeons. To achieve a wildlife corridor through Guildford, that can also benefit the health and well-being of residents living close by, the green space retained beside the river should be managed with the needs of wildlife in mind.

Responses to policy notes:

4.6.33 Villages are generally permeable to wildlife. The lower density of housing and presence of gardens (especially larger gardens) provides a corridor for movement across the residential area. Insetting of villages and the relaxation of planning restrictions in the Green Belt implied by Policy P2 will lead to infilling, “garden grabbing” and consequent loss of biodiversity. It will replace connections and corridors between habitats with barriers and lead to further fragmentation of our natural infrastructure.

4.6.34 In the past Guildford Borough Council recognised the role that wildlife gardening and management of parks and open spaces for wildlife could play in enhancing biodiversity. There seems to have been a shift away from this. These aspects should be recognised in the Plan as well as the importance of BOAs and although 4.6.35 goes part way towards this we have yet to see the GISPD.

4.6.36 This is long overdue and should include the way that our lanes are managed. The current approach is unsympathetic, sometimes damaging tree roots and scarce native plants. It seems to be oriented towards encouraging faster traffic rather than recognising the traffic-calming effects of natural vegetation (See the original Quiet Lanes Initiative) – management of open spaces and lanes

We await the Countryside Vision with interest.

4.6.37 It appears that Policy I5 has been omitted. (We think this means P5 – more evidence of slapdash work)

4.6.38 We agree with this statement but public access is frequently damaging to biodiversity – the more obvious examples being dogs out of control in the vicinity of ground-nesting birds and trampling of grassland habitats. Public open space must be protected for the reasons given but wildlife needs undisturbed (or at least less disturbed) space too if it is to thrive.

Responses to definitions:

This section starts with a definition that is not a proper definition and is followed by statements that are not definitions at all, apart from the last – suggesting that this part of the document has not been thought through or checked.

4.6.42 “Biodiversity creation and/or enhancement” is not a definition – it requires definition.

Do you mean that you will create new species or encourage them to evolve? Or do you mean that you will increase the number of species living in the Borough, or the population of each species, or both?

The points made are aspirational that have no enforcement to back them.

We support the use of green roofs and walls.
However, building on the countryside and increasing the population by such a large amount will not help vulnerable species. It will put added pressure on remaining habitats and increase light and air pollution, degrading the ability of the borough to support wildlife.

4.6.43 Arrangements with developers have no guarantee of success or longevity. They involve partial mitigation and overall loss of the original biodiversity interest of a site.

4.6.44 This appears to be saying that you will deliberately put playing fields, sports facilities and other leisure activities in BOAs – but these are land uses that reduce biodiversity!

4.6.45 Our understanding of SANG is that it is intended to reduce pressure on Special Protection Areas by providing an alternative area for people to walk their dogs – and hope that they do not prefer to use the SPA. In other words they are intended to attract the type of user that is damaging to vulnerable species such as ground-nesting birds. In the desperation to find SANG land Guildford Borough Council are making use of existing open space that will not attract people away from the SPA and you are ignoring the impact on existing wildlife. For example – GBC decided to include the towpath in the Parsonage Meadows SANG as a way of also facilitating a cycle route. Encouraging cyclists and dog-walkers to use the same narrow path will not encourage dog-walkers to use it rather than the SPA. At Effingham Common GBC plan to designate an important area for wildlife and ground-nesting Skylarks. GBC is riding roughshod over the opinions of the Commoners and local residents. GBC used to put up signage warning dog-walkers not to disturb the Skylarks during the nesting season – but these signs were not put up until well into the nesting season this year and only then after complaints and harassment of Skylarks by out-of-control dogs.

In allocating sites as SANG, GBC has ignored the requirement to consider existing biodiversity and clearly have little or any knowledge or understanding of the issue. The issues relating to Russell Place Farm have been pointed out by a qualified Biologist (see article in The Guildford Dragon by Chris Venables, Many invertebrates are dependent on the dung of grazing animals and this aspect of our countryside is being steadily driven out of our Borough).

4.6.46 We welcome this acknowledgement of the damaging effects of the proposed building developments. This also has relevance to the manner in which the green spaces next to the River Wey are managed.

4.6.47 We welcome the proposals but are concerned that these may be no more than good intentions. How will GBC ensure that they are carried out fully – and paid for by the developer? All the promises of the University when granted Manor Farm in 2003 came to nothing, no wild life trail, no classroom for children doing nature walks, no park for the residents of Guildford at Blackwell Farm, only some of the student accommodation units granted built etc etc.

**Reasoned Justification:**

4.6.50 As the emerging strategy for Surrey and the GISPD are not yet available the plan should not be proposing sites that will jeopardise them. The implication is that this aspect of the plan is not being taken seriously and will carry no weight in site selection despite the guidance in the NPPF.

4.6.51 In fact some GBC contract mowing and lane management is not in line with a strategy that is meant to protect biodiversity. Examples – damage to tree roots and unsympathetic treatment of roadside vegetation (that includes orchid species) in Chalk Lane – southern end of Kingston Meadow in East Horsley is now mown flat rather than left to grow as a meadow through the Spring and Summer as it used to be (so no more day-flying Burnet moths).

**KEY EVIDENCE**

Guildford Borough Policy Statements are statements – not evidence.

Additional evidence should include:

Existing SNCI surveys, including those that took place in 2004-2007.

Biodiversity evidence emerging from Neighbourhood Plans.

Evidence obtained by requests to local naturalists and natural history societies including those with a specialist interest.

**MONITORING**

Simply maintaining open space will not be enough for a significantly enlarged population.
Providing more open space to meet existing shortfalls or the needs of a much larger population will reduce the area of land currently in food production or providing wildlife habitat.

SANG delivery is harming existing biodiversity

It is not clear how you will measure a change in biodiversity just by looking at planning applications. “Net gains in biodiversity provided by development” is a contradiction in terms. There may well be a few examples in England where low density housing has been combined with manufactured habitat at the expense of loss of agricultural land with no surrounding habitat damage - but we see no evidence of that in the Local Plan. Even when a housing development replaces agricultural land it increases pressure on the surrounding countryside. A simple example is where houses border woodland and residents dump their garden rubbish (and often worse) over the garden fence. Increased leisure use on nearby countryside also has an adverse effect on biodiversity.

There is no guarantee that mitigations listed in an application will be carried out and their effectiveness is not guaranteed either. GBC would need to carry out follow-up ecological surveys on all sites. Who would pay for these? Are there enough consultants to carry out the work in sufficient detail? What aspects of biodiversity will be measured?

How frequently are surveys by Natural England intended to take place? How will GBC ensure that NE carry them out? A baseline of existing surveys against which changes will be monitored should be included within the plan and it must be comprehensive for monitoring to be effective.

How frequently will SNCI surveys be carried out? At what expense? The last survey published in 2007 made recommendations for an increase in the size of the Wisley Airfield SNCI and stated that this should be taken into account for planning purposes. This was overridden in the recent planning inspector’s report and the Local Plan includes this particular SNCI as a building site. This is clearly a case of hypocrisy and suggests that the Council has no genuine intention to maintain biodiversity let alone enhance it.

We believe that a survey of SNCIs is currently taking place but that it is limited in scope to the previously known sites. This prevents other sites, where genuine biodiversity enhancement has taken place (often as a result of volunteer community effort), from being recognised in this way. While every stone is being turned over in the quest to find green space to build on, no genuine effort is being made to identify biodiversity hotspots that may have been overlooked in the past. In other words the approach being taken is one that intends to make no net gain, and possibly even reduce, sites of nature conservation interest – in contradiction to the stated aims.

If an existing SNCI (or one proposed on grounds of biodiversity but not formally accepted in a Local Plan) is found to be in poor condition the action taken should be to bring it back into good condition – not to remove its status and build on it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18651  Respondent: 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?  ( ), is Sound?  ( ), is Legally Compliant?  ( )

I object to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that:

- It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;
- The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;
- Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;
• Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.
• The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2439  Respondent: 8858433 / Eric Peters  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy 14 Green and Blue Infrastructure

I object. The plan to build on Green Belt and villages will cancel out any benefits of enhancing biodiversity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2238  Respondent: 8860897 / Julia Shaw  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Response type: OBJECT

The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which is welcome. I also note and welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. However the current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will have the opposite effect. The Policy appears therefore to be a box-ticking exercise with no real teeth to it.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

“The natural world, its biodiversity and its constituent ecosystems are critically important to our wellbeing and economic prosperity, but are consistently undervalued in conventional economic analyses and decision-making” (Biodiversity 2020 page 11)

“As a public authority in England you have a duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of your policy or decision making.” (Government Planning Guidance)

Part of the problem is that “Biodiversity benefits are unpriced” and so not valued by those who look only at the more obvious and simplistic economic benefits.

I have some concerns that “enhancing” the River Wey in the town centre will avoid using the available brownfield land around Walnut Tree Close and Slyfield for urban regeneration and sustainable housing that could otherwise be used.

Why should the Walnut Tree Close/Woodbridge Meadows industrial area not be regenerated from bus garages, urban car parks and empty factories to offer sustainable, well designed, urban homes which are medium height, and can meet almost all of Guildford’s real housing needs?
The policy on Green and Blue infrastructure is broadly supported with an important and major caveat; and if disregarded this should count as an objection.

However, it is noted that the largest areas of industrial brownfield land within the borough are near to or adjacent to the River Wey, particularly in the Walnut Tree Close area and in the Slyfield industrial area.

These areas could support much more housing than the relatively small numbers indicated in the policy on the town centre, under a town centre regeneration scheme. This would have huge benefits for the community as a whole since relatively run down areas would be subject to regeneration, the river banks would be cleaner and more attractive.

It is vitally important for the town as a whole that the run-down Walnut Tree Close area is used for well-designed housing, as indicated by the Mastervision document first draft compiled by Allies and Morrison. John Rigg of Savills and Guildford Vision Group indicated to the Scrutiny Committee of GBC that initial commercial projections indicated that the Walnut Tree Close area alone could provide 4000 homes. This is significantly in excess of the current GBC proposals. Both Allies & Morrison and GVG initially indicated that they believed that this site could be available for regeneration within the critical 5 year window required for the local plan. It is therefore essential that nothing in this policy should jeopardise anything that could lead to the Walnut Tree Close area being a regeneration zone.

As has been noted elsewhere, for reasons that are not altogether clear but appear to be connected to central government direction and a desire to maximize the Community Infrastructure Levy, there is an aggressive desire to push development on to the Green Belt at all costs, ignoring or eliminating for other reasons sites which could be used in the town for residential purposes. This has informed recent planning decisions (both the Aldi site and the Waitrose site were originally zoned for residential purposes and were eminently suitable for this) and this bias seems to be informing the Local Plan.

As a result, it is important that the desire for Green and Blue infrastructure does not become an excuse for preventing regeneration of Walnut Tree Close. It is noted that the Council has stated that “The Council is keen to protect the watercourses from inappropriate development that would spoil their character”. The bus station adjacent to the River Wey, and the empty car parks associated with empty factory space, are hardly attractive development – well designed mid height (3-4 storey) apartment blocks would be a great improvement to the river corridor, offer major scope for sustainable regeneration, and would prevent the need for any incursion into the Green Belt to meet reasonable housing needs.

That regeneration zone would be highly sustainable, because it would be within 1 mile of the railway station, adjacent to the A3, and would eliminate an area of huge congestion in the town because if the industrial sites were replaced by housing then the residents would commute by train or walk to work rather than having to drive in to an industrial estate.

It certainly does not seem appropriate to create substantial new parkland on current hard standing. The protections to which this policy refers largely describe existing open space, which is of great importance. But to determine not to utilize brownfield land for residential use at an appropriate density in order to force building on to the Green Belt would seem to be in contradiction of the principles of use of the Green Belt applied in the Gallaher Homes v Solihull court of appeal case, where the hierarchy of use is clearly defined, with urban brownfield required to be used as a first option.

So there is some considerable support for the residential element of this policy, with the note that this should be explicitly amended to permit construction of a regeneration zone on the brownfield areas surrounding the river in the middle of the town, and that this should not be held up pending yet more transport studies (Guildford’s track record on brownfield utilisation is poor), but should be implemented with immediate effect.

It is not clear what form the “parkland” along the River Wey will take but the images available in the Town Centre MasterPlan suggest mown grass similar to the area around Millmead. This misses an opportunity to enhance biodiversity and enable town centre residents to engage with wildlife. Engagement with wildlife should mean much more than throwing bread at ducks and chasing pigeons. To achieve a wildlife corridor through Guildford, that can also benefit the health and well-being of residents living close by, the green space retained beside the river should be managed with the needs of wildlife in mind.

Responses to policy notes:

4.6.33 Villages are generally permeable to wildlife. The lower density of housing and presence of gardens (especially larger gardens) provides a corridor for movement across the residential area. Insetting of villages and the relaxation of planning restrictions in the Green Belt implied by Policy P2 will lead to infilling, “garden grabbing” and consequent loss of biodiversity. It will replace connections and corridors between habitats with barriers and lead to further fragmentation of our natural infrastructure.
4.6.34 In the past Guildford Borough Council recognised the role that wildlife gardening and management of parks and open spaces for wildlife could play in enhancing biodiversity. There seems to have been a shift away from this. These aspects should be recognised in the Plan as well as the importance of BOAs and although 4.6.35 goes part way towards this I have yet to see the GISPD.

4.6.36 This is long overdue and should include the way that our lanes are managed. The current approach is unsympathetic, sometimes damaging tree roots and scarce native plants. It seems to be oriented towards encouraging faster traffic rather than recognising the traffic-calming effects of natural vegetation (See the original Quiet Lanes Initiative) – management of open spaces and lanes

I await the Countryside Vision with interest.

4.6.37 It appears that Policy I5 has been omitted. (I think this means P5 – more evidence of slapdash work)

4.6.38 I agree with this statement but public access is frequently damaging to biodiversity – the more obvious examples being dogs out of control in the vicinity of ground-nesting birds and trampling of grassland habitats. Public open space must be protected for the reasons given but wildlife needs undisturbed (or at least less disturbed) space too if it is to thrive.

Responses to definitions:

This section starts with a definition that is not a proper definition and is followed by statements that are not definitions at all, apart from the last – suggesting that this part of the document has not been thought through or checked.

4.6.42 “Biodiversity creation and/or enhancement” is not a definition – it requires definition.

Do you mean that you will create new species or encourage them to evolve? Or do you mean that you will increase the number of species living in the Borough, or the population of each species, or both?

The points made are aspirational that have no enforcement to back them.

I support the use of green roofs and walls.

However, building on the countryside and increasing the population by such a large amount will not help vulnerable species. It will put added pressure on remaining habitats and increase light and air pollution, degrading the ability of the borough to support wildlife.

4.6.43 Arrangements with developers have no guarantee of success or longevity. They involve partial mitigation and overall loss of the original biodiversity interest of a site.

4.6.44 This appears to be saying that you will deliberately put playing fields, sports facilities and other leisure activities in BOAs – but these are land uses that reduce biodiversity!

4.6.45 My understanding of SANG is that it is intended to reduce pressure on Special Protection Areas by providing an alternative area for people to walk their dogs – and hope that they do not prefer to use the SPA. In other words they are intended to attract the type of user that is damaging to vulnerable species such as ground-nesting birds. In the desperation to find SANG land Guildford Borough Council are making use of existing open space that will not attract people away from the SPA and you are ignoring the impact on existing wildlife. For example – GBC decided to include the towpath in the Parsonage Meadows SANG as a way of also facilitating a cycle route. Encouraging cyclists and dog-walkers to use the same narrow path will not encourage dog-walkers to use it rather than the SPA. At Effingham Common GBC plan to designate an important area for wildlife and ground-nesting Skylarks. GBC is riding roughshod over the opinions of the Commoners and local residents. GBC used to put up signage warning dog-walkers not to disturb the Skylarks during the nesting season – but these signs were not put up until well into the nesting season this year and only then after complaints and harassment of Skylarks by out-of-control dogs.

In allocating sites as SANG, GBC has ignored the requirement to consider existing biodiversity and clearly have little or any knowledge or understanding of the issue. The issues relating to Russell Place Farm have been pointed out by a qualified Biologist (see article in The Guildford Dragon by Chris Venables, Many invertebrates are dependent on the dung of grazing animals and this aspect of our countryside is being steadily driven out of our Borough).
4.6.46 I welcome this acknowledgement of the damaging effects of the proposed building developments. This also has relevance to the manner in which the green spaces next to the River Wey are managed.

4.6.47 I welcome the proposals but are concerned that these may be no more than good intentions. How will GBC ensure that they are carried out fully – and paid for by the developer?

**Reasoned Justification:**

4.6.50 As the emerging strategy for Surrey and the GISPD are not yet available the plan should not be proposing sites that will jeopardise them. The implication is that this aspect of the plan is not being taken seriously and will carry no weight in site selection despite the guidance in the NPPF.

4.6.51 In fact some GBC contract mowing and lane management is not in line with a strategy that is meant to protect biodiversity. Examples – damage to tree roots and unsympathetic treatment of roadside vegetation (that includes orchid species) in Chalk Lane – southern end of Kingston Meadow in East Horsley is now mown flat rather than left to grow as a meadow through the Spring and Summer as it used to be (so no more day-flying Burnet moths).

**KEY EVIDENCE**

Guildford Borough Policy Statements are statements – not evidence.

Additional evidence should include:

Existing SNCI surveys, including those that took place in 2004-2007.

Biodiversity evidence emerging from Neighbourhood Plans.

Evidence obtained by requests to local naturalists and natural history societies including those with a specialist interest.

**MONITORING**

Simply maintaining open space will not be enough for a significantly enlarged population.

Providing more open space to meet existing shortfalls or the needs of a much larger population will reduce the area of land currently in food production or providing wildlife habitat.

SANG delivery is harming existing biodiversity

It is not clear how you will measure a change in biodiversity just by looking at planning applications. “Net gains in biodiversity provided by development” is a contradiction in terms. There may well be a few examples in England where low density housing has been combined with manufactured habitat at the expense of loss of agricultural land with no surrounding habitat damage - but I see no evidence of that in the Local Plan. Even when a housing development replaces agricultural land it increases pressure on the surrounding countryside. A simple example is where houses border woodland and residents dump their garden rubbish (and often worse) over the garden fence. Increased leisure use on nearby countryside also has an adverse effect on biodiversity.

There is no guarantee that mitigations listed in an application will be carried out and their effectiveness is not guaranteed either. GBC would need to carry out follow-up ecological surveys on all sites. Who would pay for these ? Are there enough consultants to carry out the work in sufficient detail ? What aspects of biodiversity will be measured?

How frequently are surveys by Natural England intended to take place ? How will GBC ensure that NE carry them out ?

A baseline of existing surveys against which changes will be monitored should be included within the plan and it must be comprehensive for monitoring to be effective.

How frequently will SNCI surveys be carried out ? At what expense ? The last survey published in 2007 made recommendations for an increase in the size of the Wisley Airfield SNCI and stated that this should be taken into account for planning purposes. This was overridden in the recent planning inspector’s report and the Local Plan includes this particular SNCI as a building site. This is clearly a case of hypocrisy and suggests that the Council has no genuine intention to maintain biodiversity let alone enhance it.
I believe that a survey of SNCIs is currently taking place but that it is limited in scope to the previously known sites. This prevents other sites, where genuine biodiversity enhancement has taken place (often as a result of volunteer community effort), from being recognised in this way. While every stone is being turned over in the quest to find green space to build on, no genuine effort is being made to identify biodiversity hotspots that may have been overlooked in the past. In other words the approach being taken is one that intends to make no net gain, and possibly even reduce, sites of nature conservation interest – in contradiction to the stated aims.

If an existing SNCI (or one proposed on grounds of biodiversity but not formally accepted in a Local Plan) is found to be in poor condition the action taken should be to bring it back into good condition – not to remove its status and build on it.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/9746  **Respondent:** 8864161 / Phyllis Kirkland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

What about the birds and animals. What right have you got to dispense with any and everywhere that they live? They have a right to life too and, believe it or not, they do help us as well.

Stop encouraging people to come here [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/541  **Respondent:** 8865281 / R G Dedman  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object strongly to the proposed development at Garlicks Arch, as this would involve the clearance of ancient woodland which is mainly of Oak trees, which is home for Deer Pheasants, Foxes Rabbits, and of course a bird population.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2849  **Respondent:** 8865377 / Angus Mcintosh  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In terms of culture and scenically, with the River Wey, Guildford could become one of THE most attractive commuter towns of London, but the is NO ASPIRATION in the plan to enhance this; it's a notoriously traffic-jammed disgrace.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
All the West Horsley sites are enlarging the parish boundaries into green spaces and in particular the development sites at; A38 Manor Farm, A40 Waterloo Farm and A41, East Lane; contribute to the openness and rural character of the village. Additionally restraints on these sites relating to wildlife corridors.

In the case of the open green fields of site A41, this is a truly rural character of the village with its ancient woodland beyond to the south and hence should not be included in the proposed sites as no ‘special circumstances’ as defined by the NPPF have been demonstrated nor likely to be by definition.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Sangs are created so that building houses can get the go-ahead. We do not want development in this area of exceptional natural beauty.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the plan due to the impact upon pollution.

The increase in traffic across the area will increase harmful toxins in the air, already an issue in some areas of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the fact that the proposed development plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are 1) access to the countryside and clean air and 2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village's green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/5058  **Respondent:** 8887297 / Ian C Milne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is a diverse range of flora and fauna in the area that would be adversely affected. Habitats adjoining A46 are Priority Habitats under the NERC Act, including protected species (European Protected Species, Species of Principal Importance and those protected by The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981).

The urban brownfield/derelict sites in the borough should be released for housing development before the development of land located within the Green Belt is considered.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/16986  **Respondent:** 8893057 / Dianne Garnett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1 **We object** to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure.

1.2 This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

1.3 There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

1 **ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY**

1.1 **We object** to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that:

- It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, and ecological value, architectural and historic interest;
- The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;
- Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;
- Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.
- The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved.
2 GREEN BELT SITES

2.1 We object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan.

2.2 We object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.” This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are sick and tired of repeating the same comments to deaf ears. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.13

2.3 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

2.4 All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/14762</th>
<th>Respondent: 8896161 / Carol Wilson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure

No comment

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2658</th>
<th>Respondent: 8900577 / Ann-Marie Bound</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The green belt is essential to maintain an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure pursuits can flourish. This is exactly what has happened here and with the ever increasing outward pressure from London, it is even more important that the countryside is preserved for all to enjoy

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8170</th>
<th>Respondent: 8902465 / Linda Slater</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):

• No teeth. Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

SITES

I OBJECT TO ALL POLICIES INVOLVING BUILDING IN THE GREEN BELT:

• No “exceptional circumstances” shown, numbers excessive and the clearly expressed views of residents in previous consultations ignored.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16947  Respondent: 8902689 / Lyndell Mussell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I 4 - strong support for of enhancing biodiversity - paragraph4.6.31. Please include the word "allotments" in the definition of Green Infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1471  Respondent: 8904161 / Geoffrey & Lesley Tregaskes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously - air pollution particularly at the M25/ A3 junction is already in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Parish Plans.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5807  Respondent: 8907713 / S.J. Gilbert  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---
1. Kingston Meadows is the only public recreational space in East Horsley. It has sports facilities, play facilities for children and playing fields for sport and village activities such as the recent very popular and successful 90th Birthday Party for Queen Elizabeth and to lose these would be a disaster.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16667  Respondent: 8907713 / S.J. Gilbert  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Kingston Meadows is the only public recreational space in East Horsley. It has sports facilities, play facilities for children and playing fields for sport and village activities such as the recent very popular and successful 90th Birthday Party for Queen Elizabeth and to lose these would be a disaster.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9438  Respondent: 8910817 / Anne Elkington  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plan as it will alter the character of the area and damage wildlife. Replacing the country roads and hedgerows to cope with the increase traffic will damage the environment. Increasing capacity for parking at local stations will require network rail to build multi-storey car parks at Effingham and Horsley to cope with the increase - massively altering the character of the villages. There is little spare capacity on morning commuter trains to cope with the increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12082  Respondent: 8914945 / Nichola Armstrong  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy 14.Insetting sites on Green Belt does not enhance biodiversity. It is destructive. Research shows our wildlife has drastically declined over the last 20 years to alarming levels, even our most common species are seriously under threat. Local councils and the government needs to really take this issue seriously. Insetting on agricultural land is a long term disaster, with an agricultural land shortage of 10% estimated by 2020. The damage being inflicted on our rural areas is at a tipping point.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9456  Respondent: 8915073 / Alastair Lawson  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

‘Development will not be permitted within or adjacent to national sites unless it can be shown that doing so would not be harmful to the nature conservation interests of the site. Permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity.’

The Friends of Normandy Wildlife who have locals experts in this field have produced an excellent response in this area and one that I cant surpass. What I can say it is would appear that an increase in pets, people, transport etc will have an adverse impact on the nature conservation of the area.

However all the habitats within or adjoining the proposed development site are Priority Habitats of Principal Importance under the NERC Act, plus a number of protected species (European Protected Species, Species of Principal Importance and those protected under The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) as amended) have been recorded within either the proposed development site or 500m to 1km of the proposed development site.

These include Hedgehogs, Dormice, Great Crested Newts, Barn Owls, Stag Beetles, Skylarks, Common Toads, Common Lizards, Grass Snakes, Adders, Slow worms, Badgers and Bats (including potential roosts within a number of veteran and mature oaks and other trees across the proposed development site and within the woodland blocks).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1429  Respondent: 8917665 / Frances Porter  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the local plan as no real consideration has been given to the already bad air pollution problem, which the government is highlighting but GBC seem to have not investigated any further at this junction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8106  Respondent: 8918977 / SJ and LA Leheup  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Nature conservation

- Loss of important habitats eg SNCI

- Compromises SPA/SSSI

- Loss of agricultural land cannot be reversed
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2649  **Respondent:** 8924065 / Rachel & Colin Holloway  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7) I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of the site, in relation to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI).

8) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

9) I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/1212  **Respondent:** 8925153 / D B Saidman  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of the site, in relation to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI).

2. I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

3. I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/11001  **Respondent:** 8926401 / Christine Medlow  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
I welcome the importance placed on the River Wey as a source of bio-diversity and open space. I suggest that an additional objective be added to make the Wey a continuous wildlife corridor.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLICY 14 Green and blue infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We support this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15916  Respondent: 8930625 / Malcolm Scott  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scant consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of the site, in relation to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic would exacerbate this, impacting the health of current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of habitat degradation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2967  Respondent: 8933889 / Nicholas Travers  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/16061  Respondent: 8941761 / FLGCA (Paul Kassell)  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst we support the attempts to protect biodiversity, we have shown under Policy P5 that in practice the Council pays lip service to the protection of our valuable areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We also object to the inexact wording used. This policy replaces G5(10) which was worded: “Open spaces, whether public or private, which contribute to the character of an area, in terms of the views they create, the feeling of openness they allow, are protected.” This has been modified as far as this policy is concerned: “Open space (encompassing all open space within urban areas, land designated as Open Space on the Policies Map and all land and water that provides opportunities for recreation and sport) will be protected from development in accordance with the NPPF.” The old policy, although shorter, is felt to be more all-encompassing. What if an open space does not appear in the policy map? An example would be a large roundabout surrounding a small green – according to this policy, it can now be built upon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17230  Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the inadequate protection of the environment in terms of wildlife, SNCIs, SPA; in terms of air pollution and noise and light pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9387  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure

I OBJECT to this policy in its current form. It says that the Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity, but this is at odds with the rest of the draft local plan which proposes to build on green belt land and to inset, infill and urbanise villages (which currently include wildlife corridors which help to protect and promote biodiversity across the borough).

Whilst I support the aims of protecting and promoting biodiversity and open spaces, this policy, together with the rest of the proposed local plan, will not achieve those aims.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16148  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The villages that contribute to the rural nature of the borough should be protected, not enlarged, infilled, commercialised, polluted by additional traffic, stripped of their biodiversity, and otherwise urbanised.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16175  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to this policy in its current form. It says that the Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity, but this is at odds with the rest of the draft local plan which proposes to build on green belt land and to inset, infill and urbanise villages (which currently include wildlife corridors which help to protect and promote biodiversity across the borough).

Whilst I support the aims of protecting and promoting biodiversity and open spaces, this policy, together with the rest of the proposed local plan, will not achieve those aims.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2546  Respondent: 8958369 / B.P. Austin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Green and Blue Infrastructure.

1. I support policy 14 on Green and Blue Infrastructure but on the evidence of the proposed site allocations I question whether these policies will prove robust enough to withstand the commercial pressures of developers. The monitoring will have to be serious and adequately funded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/7471  Respondent: 8962977 / Lizzie J Spinks  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to Guildford Borough Council's Draft Local Plan June 2016.

It would ruin what makes Guildford and Surrey special, the lovely amount of green we live amongst.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The University broadly supports this policy and would highlight the opportunities at Blackwell Farm (Policy A26) for the creation of a network of high quality, flexible and useable green spaces as part of the masterplan, retaining and making best use of existing green assets such as woodland areas and incorporating measures intended to enhance biodiversity. These features will provide opportunities for play, leisure and relaxation through the provision of on-site SANG. Opportunities also exist to provide blue infrastructure networks through the provision of small-scale bodies of water as part of the drainage strategy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Whilst I accept the SANG in principle I agree with the view of the Tyting Society that a continued tenancy by Surrey Wildlife Trust to retain the farmland in agricultural use for the indefinite future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I support this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

POLICY I4 Green and Blue infrastructure
OBJECT The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which is welcome. I also note and welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. However the current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will have the opposite effect. The Policy appears therefore to be a box-checking exercise with no real teeth to it.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp171/1875  **Respondent:** 9062913 / Susan Parker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) seem to have been heavily influenced by the proposal of new identified settlement boundaries, in this draft local plan. The proposal in themselves have not been fully considered; they threaten landscape and biodiversity.

Biodiversity will be seriously damaged by the many greenfield development sites proposed. We are suspicious of the use of the phrase “where possible”, which is a let-out.

Important habitats for biodiversity (outside BOAs) include many which are not adjacent to BOAs. There is no proper concern for protection of such areas.

4.6.45 is misleading. The primary ostensible role of SANGs is to divert recreational use, and dog-walkers in particular, away from the TBHSPA.

It is extremely doubtful whether new SANG will achieve its primary purpose. For example, dog walkers are being encouraged to use sites occupied by ground-nesting Skylarks. It is wrong to claim, in effect, that SANG will produce net gains in biodiversity when it will be used to justify the destruction of existing wildlife on greenfield sites by building on it.

Land used for SANG should be made attractive in order to divert recreational use away from the SPA; but this cannot be achieved by a SANG which is adjacent to the SPA or many of the sites proposed.

I object to the introduction of 4.6.49a which appears to be an afterthought to weaken the policy.

Existing biodiversity and recreational use is being ignored by Guildford Borough Council and developers in selecting sites.

In practice, SANG is being used in order to avoid any restriction on housebuilding due to the SPA; and is effectively a Trojan horse. Furthermore, all such sites are by definition already green spaces with either biodiversity or recreational uses.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8700  **Respondent:** 9070241 / Adrian Butler  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Pollution: I strongly object to the new draft plan proposing additional 2000 homes at Wisley, 2000 at Gosden Hill Farm, nearly 600 in The Horsleys and 400 at Garlicks Arch as it will have a great impact on the local road network which at peak times is already struggling. The large increase in volume of traffic will cause an increase in nitrogen dioxide and particulates in the environment – already a cause for concern in several areas in the borough. Additional noise and air pollution will be inevitable with this increase in traffic and it will have a significant impact on our environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18567  Respondent: 9079393 / Wisley Property Investments Ltd.  Agent: Savills (Charles Collins)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4: Green and Blue infrastructure

Object (not effective in respect of NPPF paragraph 182)

We are strongly supportive of the principles and aims set out in draft Policy I4. However, we recommend some adjustments to the current wording of the draft policy and supporting text in order to ensure consistency with the NPPF.

The absolute requirement for new development to provide ‘net gains’ in biodiversity in all cases is not enshrined in the NPPF, which makes reference to delivering net gains in biodiversity ‘where possible’. Whilst we support the delivery of net gains in biodiversity where possible, and see this as a wholly positive aspiration, the Local Plan must nonetheless be consistent with national policy. The draft policy wording should therefore be amended to ensure consistency with the NPPF.

The draft policy wording states that “where proposals fall within or adjacent to a BOA, biodiversity measures should support that BOA’s objectives.” Again, whilst it is good practice for proposals to seek to support the objectives of the BOA into which they fall, these areas are broad and strategic in nature, and in many instances it is likely that alternative biodiversity enhancements are more appropriate for particular sites and proposals. This statement should therefore be amended to enable greater flexibility for schemes to deliver the most appropriate biodiversity measures at a particular location; the addition of ‘where appropriate’ at the end of the above sentence would allow for this. This would also be consistent with GBC’s interpretation at paragraph 4.8, bullet point 1 of the ‘Green and Blue Infrastructure Topic Paper’.

The draft wording also states that “permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity.” We broadly support this position, although in our view the policy should also make reference to the need to provide impact avoidance insofar as is possible in the first instance, and where unavoidable impacts are then likely, mitigation and/or compensation measures taken where necessary, in accordance with the NPPF.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 160715_Local_Plan_Reps_July_2016_and_Appendices.pdf (11.0 MB)

Comment ID: pslp171/2762  Respondent: 9079393 / Wisley Property Investments Ltd.  Agent: Savills (Jim Beavan)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy / Section / page / para</th>
<th>Original Changes requested (July 2016 Representation)</th>
<th>Understanding of changes shown in the Focused Amendments (June 2017)</th>
<th>WPI Comments (Updated Representation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy I4: Green and Blue Infrastructure Page 118</td>
<td>WPI supports the draft policy. (Page 136) Minor wording changes only.</td>
<td>Changes noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12378  **Respondent:** 9237953 / Patricia Wood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the loss of natural habitat for our local flora and fauna, which the Proposed Local Plan would impose

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/14966  **Respondent:** 9327009 / sp2 Consulting Limited (Stephen Parker)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT. The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which is welcome. I also note and welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. However the current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will have the opposite effect. The Policy appears therefore to be a boxticking exercise with no real teeth to it. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting. There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/10661  **Respondent:** 9335041 / David Reeve  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4: Green and Blue Infrastructure
It is surprising to find this policy in the same document that proposes a very substantial increase in the number of houses, the removal of Green Belt protection from fifteen villages in the borough, the construction of two thirds of the proposed housing on land that is currently in the Green Belt, and a 2,000 unit housing development built right up to the boundaries of the AONB. With this level of development, it is difficult to countenance the suggestion that this policy will have any credible effect on green and blue infrastructure. Therefore OBJECT to the clear inconsistency of the Local Plan as a whole.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? 

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1585  Respondent: 10617441 / Graham Sykes  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

8) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously- air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

9) I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village's green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? 

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1593  Respondent: 10617569 / Lydia Sykes  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

8) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously- air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

9) I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village's green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? 

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8240  Respondent: 10662849 / Garry Walton  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
**POLICY 14 Green and blue infrastructure**

I OBJECT. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8515</th>
<th>Respondent: 10721473 / David French</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to place on record my objections to your Local plan for Send. It is a rural village and greatly loved by its inhabitants for its open green spaces, it's walks by the Send Navigation Canal and open fields, and for its varied mix of vegetation and flora and fauna, particularly deer, rabbits, bats, water mammals, and many varied birds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/5995</th>
<th>Respondent: 10729345 / M. Osborn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to removing the Send Lakes from being a (Site of Nature Conservation Interest) SNCI status. Bats, Herons, Kingfishers and Hedgehogs are all part of the wildlife that can been seen in and around the Lakes. The local plan should encourage this through policies aimed at preserving the lakes SNCI status as a part of the local plan's environmental sustainability. It should not be removing them from SNCI status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2570</th>
<th>Respondent: 10731233 / Linda Aris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to ancient woodland being destroyed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/594  Respondent: 10756961 / Carol Marsh  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that this plan if implemented would leave sites of outstanding natural beauty as islands of conservation surrounded by developed areas

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1423  Respondent: 10782625 / Heather Alexander  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously- air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU permitted Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, Impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible Impact of the habitat degradation.

2. I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village's green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13717  Respondent: 10782625 / Heather Alexander  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):

• No teeth. Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/323  Respondent: 10799169 / Neal Basson  Agent:
Impact on Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
The impact of the proposed housing estates would be to blight the surrounding areas of outstanding natural beauty. Many of the proposed sites are so close to such areas that it would no longer be appropriate to refer to these as such, as they would become reducing areas of green countryside, surrounded by urban sprawl.

Most of the areas proposed for potential developments are contiguous with AONB and it is my understanding that statutory protection is afforded to areas contiguous with AONB.

Impact on Wildlife
The impact on wildlife in the Horsleys would be devastating. In my own garden, I have had grass snakes, hedgehogs, weasels, toads and deer and have observed red kites and woodpeckers. These species would be under threat form loss of habitat, and in some cases, predatory cats, the population of which would increase with the proposed rise in homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/348  Respondent: 10799169 / Neal Basson  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I4 Green and Blue infrastructure
OBJECT The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which is welcome. We also note and welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. However the current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will have the opposite effect. The Policy appears therefore to be a box-ticking exercise with no real teeth to it.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

The Council needs to completely rethink its priorities and very carefully consider the views and requirements of the borough’s residents. We need a less contentious and more viable plan, which proposes a sustainable and suitable level of development. The use of brownfield sites should be high on the agenda.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
As has been noted elsewhere, for reasons that are not altogether clear but appear to be connected to central government direction and a desire to maximize the Community Infrastructure Levy, there is an aggressive desire to push development on to the Green Belt at all costs, ignoring or eliminating for other reasons sites which could be used in the town for residential purposes. This has informed recent planning decisions (both the Aldi site and the Waitrose site were originally zoned for residential purposes and were eminently suitable for this) and this bias seems to be informing the Local Plan.

As a result, it is important that the desire for Green and Blue infrastructure does not become an excuse for preventing regeneration of Walnut Tree Close. It is noted that the Council has stated that “The Council is keen to protect the watercourses from inappropriate development that would spoil their character”. The bus station adjacent to the River Wey, and the empty car parks associated with empty factory space, are hardly attractive development – well designed mid height (3-4 storey) apartment blocks would be a great improvement to the river corridor, offer major scope for sustainable regeneration, and would prevent the need for any incursion into the Green Belt to meet reasonable housing needs.

That regeneration zone would be highly sustainable, because it would be within 1 mile of the railway station, adjacent to the A3, and would eliminate an area of huge congestion in the town because if the industrial sites were replaced by housing then the residents would commute by train or walk to work rather than having to drive in to an industrial estate.

It certainly does not seem appropriate to create substantial new parkland on current hard standing. The protections to which this policy refers largely describe existing open space, which is of great importance. But to determine not to utilize brownfield land for residential use at an appropriate density in order to force building on to the Green Belt would seem to be in contradiction of the principles of use of the Green Belt applied in the Gallaher Homes v Solihull court of appeal case, where the hierarchy of use is clearly defined, with urban brownfield required to be used as a first option.

So there is some considerable support for the residential element of this policy, with the note that this should be explicitly amended to permit construction of a regeneration zone on the brownfield areas surrounding the river in the middle of the town, and that this should not be held up pending yet more transport studies (Guildford’s track record on brownfield utilisation is poor), but should be implemented with immediate effect.

It is not clear what form the “parkland” along the River Wey will take but the images available in the Town Centre MasterPlan suggest mown grass similar to the area around Millmead. This misses an opportunity to enhance biodiversity and enable town centre residents to engage with wildlife. Engagement with wildlife should mean much more than throwing bread at ducks and chasing pigeons. To achieve a wildlife corridor through Guildford, that can also benefit the health and well-being of residents living close by, the green space retained beside the river should be managed with the needs of wildlife in mind.

Responses to policy notes:

4.6.33 Villages are generally permeable to wildlife. The lower density of housing and presence of gardens (especially larger gardens) provides a corridor for movement across the residential area. Insetting of villages and the relaxation of planning restrictions in the Green Belt implied by Policy P2 will lead to infilling, “garden grabbing” and consequent loss of biodiversity. It will replace connections and corridors between habitats with barriers and lead to further fragmentation of our natural infrastructure.

4.6.34 In the past Guildford Borough Council recognised the role that wildlife gardening and management of parks and open spaces for wildlife could play in enhancing biodiversity. There seems to have been a shift away from this. These aspects should be recognised in the Plan as well as the importance of BOAs and although 4.6.35 goes part way towards this we have yet to see the GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT.

4.6.36 This is long overdue and should include the way that our lanes are managed. The current approach is unsympathetic, sometimes damaging tree roots and scarce native plants. It seems to be oriented towards encouraging faster traffic rather than recognising the traffic-calming effects of natural vegetation (See the original Quiet Lanes Initiative) – management of open spaces and lanes

We await the Countryside Vision with interest.

4.6.37 It appears that Policy I5 has been omitted. (We think this means P5 – more evidence of slapdash work)

4.6.38 We agree with this statement but public access is frequently damaging to biodiversity – the more obvious examples being dogs out of control in the vicinity of ground-nesting birds and trampling of grassland habitats. Public open space must be protected for the reasons given but wildlife needs undisturbed (or at least less disturbed) space too if it is to thrive.
Responses to definitions:

This section starts with a definition that is not a proper definition and is followed by statements that are not definitions at all, apart from the last – suggesting that this part of the document has not been thought through or checked.

4.6.42 “Biodiversity creation and/or enhancement” is not a definition – it requires definition.

Do you mean that you will create new species or encourage them to evolve? Or do you mean that you will increase the number of species living in the Borough, or the population of each species, or both?

The points made are aspirational that have no enforcement to back them.

We support the use of green roofs and walls.

However, building on the countryside and increasing the population by such a large amount will not help vulnerable species. It will put added pressure on remaining habitats and increase light and air pollution, degrading the ability of the borough to support wildlife.

4.6.43 Arrangements with developers have no guarantee of success or longevity. They involve partial mitigation and overall loss of the original biodiversity interest of a site.

4.6.44 This appears to be saying that you will deliberately put playing fields, sports facilities and other leisure activities in BOAs – but these are land uses that reduce biodiversity!

4.6.45 Our understanding of SANG is that it is intended to reduce pressure on Special Protection Areas by providing an alternative area for people to walk their dogs – and hope that they do not prefer to use the SPA. In other words they are intended to attract the type of user that is damaging to vulnerable species such as ground-nesting birds. In the desperation to find SANG land Guildford Borough Council are making use of existing open space that will not attract people away from the SPA and you are ignoring the impact on existing wildlife. For example – GBC decided to include the towpath in the Parsonage Meadows SANG as a way of also facilitating a cycle route. Encouraging cyclists and dog-walkers to use the same narrow path will not encourage dog-walkers to use it rather than the SPA. At Effingham Common GBC plan to designate an important area for wildlife and ground-nesting Skylarks. GBC is riding roughshod over the opinions of the Commoners and local residents. GBC used to put up signage warning dog-walkers not to disturb the Skylarks during the nesting season – but these signs were not put up until well into the nesting season this year and only then after complaints and harassment of Skylarks by out-of-control dogs.

In allocating sites as SANG, GBC has ignored the requirement to consider existing biodiversity and clearly have little or any knowledge or understanding of the issue. The issues relating to Russell Place Farm have been pointed out by a qualified Biologist. Many invertebrates are dependent on the dung of grazing animals and this aspect of our countryside is being steadily driven out of our Borough.

4.6.46 We welcome this acknowledgement of the damaging effects of the proposed building developments. This also has relevance to the manner in which the green spaces next to the River Wey are managed.

4.6.47 We welcome the proposals but are concerned that these may be no more than good intentions. How will GBC ensure that they are carried out fully – and paid for by the developer?

Reasoned Justification:

4.6.50 As the emerging strategy for Surrey and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document (GISPD) are not yet available the plan should not be proposing sites that will be jeopardised. The implication is that this aspect of the plan is not being taken seriously and will carry no weight in site selection despite the guidance in the NPPF.

4.6.51 In fact some GBC contract mowing and lane management is not in line with a strategy that is meant to protect biodiversity.

KEY EVIDENCE

Guildford Borough Policy Statements are statements – not evidence.

Additional evidence should include:
Existing SNCI surveys, including those that took place in 2004-2007.

Biodiversity evidence emerging from Neighbourhood Plans.

Evidence obtained by requests to local naturalists and natural history societies including those with a specialist interest.

**MONITORING**

Simply maintaining open space will not be enough for a significantly enlarged population.

Providing more open space to meet existing shortfalls or the needs of a much larger population will reduce the area of land currently in food production or providing wildlife habitat.

SANG delivery is harming existing biodiversity

It is not clear how you will measure a change in biodiversity just by looking at planning applications. “Net gains in biodiversity provided by development” is a contradiction in terms. There may well be a few examples in England where low density housing has been combined with manufactured habitat at the expense of loss of agricultural land with no surrounding habitat damage - but we see no evidence of that in the Local Plan. Even when a housing development replaces agricultural land it increases pressure on the surrounding countryside. A simple example is where houses border woodland and residents dump their garden rubbish (and often worse) over the garden fence. Increased leisure use on nearby countryside also has an adverse effect on biodiversity.

There is no guarantee that mitigations listed in an application will be carried out and their effectiveness is not guaranteed either. GBC would need to carry out follow-up ecological surveys on all sites. Who would pay for these? Are there enough consultants to carry out the work in sufficient detail? What aspects of biodiversity will be measured?

How frequently are surveys by Natural England intended to take place? How will GBC ensure that NE carry them out? A baseline of existing surveys against which changes will be monitored should be included within the plan and it must be comprehensive for monitoring to be effective.

How frequently will SNCI surveys be carried out? At what expense? The last survey published in 2007 made recommendations for an increase in the size of the Wisley Airfield SNCI and stated that this should be taken into account for planning purposes. This was overridden in the recent planning inspector’s report and the Local Plan includes this particular SNCI as a building site. This is clearly a case of hypocrisy and suggests that the Council has no genuine intention to maintain biodiversity let alone enhance it.

We believe that a survey of SNCIs is currently taking place but that it is limited in scope to the previously known sites. This prevents other sites, where genuine biodiversity enhancement has taken place (often as a result of volunteer community effort), from being recognised in this way. While every stone is being turned over in the quest to find green space to build on, no genuine effort is being made to identify biodiversity hotspots that may have been overlooked in the past. In other words the approach being taken is one that intends to make no net gain, and possibly even reduce, sites of nature conservation interest – in contradiction to the stated aims.

If an existing SNCI (or one proposed on grounds of biodiversity but not formally accepted in a Local Plan) is found to be in poor condition the action taken should be to bring it back into good condition – not to remove its status and build on it.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLP16/837  **Respondent:** 10804961 / M. Basson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICY 14 Green and Blue infrastructure

OBJECT The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which is welcome. We also note and welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. However the current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will have the opposite effect. The Policy appears therefore to be a box-ticking exercise with no real teeth to it.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/604  Respondent: 10804993 / Alex Laing  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the fact that this plan, if implemented, would leave sites of outstanding natural beauty as islands of conservation surrounded by developed areas

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11753  Respondent: 10816481 / Jeff Waine  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Green Belt our woodlands & open spaces our not just for our wellbeing but generations to came

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6869  Respondent: 10816673 / G Hall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am also concerned that taken together these developments have an adverse effect on Nature conservation in the area.

West Horsley Parish is one of a rich and varied mix of well established low housing density settlements with a considerable number of historic buildings. There are a considerable number of recreational visitors (walkers and cyclists) through the seasons each year.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1659  Respondent: 10816705 / Maggie Cole  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9. I object to poor air/noise quality concerns

The developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to increased congestion and to greater levels of air/noise pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and wellbeing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6652  Respondent: 10829121 / Julie Brown  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to POLICY I4 Green and blue infrastructure

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
- No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.
  
  · All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/179  Respondent: 10831201 / Norma Plank  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9) I object to the Councils increasing desire to destroy ancient woodland and open spaces, and in turn the wildlife habitats they provide, in order to develop at all costs.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16682  Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been there for decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3486  Respondent: 10843361 / Natalie Brown  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to POLICY I4 Green and blue infrastructure

• Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
• Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
• Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
• Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
• No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.
• All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11945  Respondent: 10844545 / Paul Cretney  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extension of the boundaries of the settlement areas of East and West Horsley. This would place both villages at risk of further unsustainable developments in the future

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/14497  Respondent: 10846625 / Frank Drennan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1  **I object** to policy I4 “green and blue infrastructure” on the grounds that;

1.2  This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

1.3  There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1776  Respondent: 10848513 / Martin Cole  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9.  **I object** to poor air/noise quality concerns

The developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough, will lead to increased congestion and to greater levels of air/noise pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and wellbeing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13482  Respondent: 10848577 / Jen Dunbar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Residents of Send are concerned about the road safety issues, congestion, pollution, noise, destruction of wildlife habitats and disruption of village life which the planned developments will bring.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8873  Respondent: 10857889 / William Kyte OBE  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure
I OBJECT to this policy

The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which is welcome.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or of monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

The River Wey must not be subject to overdevelopment which would destroy its naturalness and a green corridor must be preserved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/662  Respondent: 10858657 / Fiona Gray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the destruction of irreplaceable ancient woodland
- I object to the destruction of habitat for wildlife

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18612  Respondent: 10858977 / Angela Otterson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure.

This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY

I object to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that:

1. It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;
2. The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;
3. Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;
4. Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.
5. The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the proposal in the local plan on the grounds that it would have serious and unwanted impact on the nature reserve nearby. The proposed site is a quality green belt amenity area within countryside and would be spoilt by development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

---

No protection of the environment

Insufficient consideration of SPA, SSI and Conservation Area issues

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

---

20. I object to the inadequate protection of the environment.

21. I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the harm that will be caused to the Special Protection Area, the Sites of Special Scientific Interest and the borough's Conservation Area and heritage assets.

22. I object to the impact of poor air quality on the Special Protection Area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I sincerely hope you, the council, will consider my objections and avoid destroying the Borough’s Green Belt which is precious and I fear for its demise. Our British countryside needs to be protected for future generations of population, animal, bird and plant life. Please protect our environment from increased pollution and flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1327  Respondent: 10897217 / Warren Hogben  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy 13)

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14035  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inadequate protection of the environment.
2. I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the harm that will be caused to the Special Protection Area, the Sites of Special Scientific Interest and the borough’s Conservation Area and heritage assets.
3. I object to the impact of poor air quality on the Special Protection Area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16140  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the impact of poor air quality on the Special Protection Area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11339  Respondent: 10923297 / Matthew Burnham  Agent:
**I OBJECT TO POLICY 14 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):**

- No teeth. Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13992  Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inadequate protection of the environment.

I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the harm that will be caused to the Special Protection Area, the Sites of Special Scientific Interest and the borough’s Conservation Area and heritage assets.

I object to the impact of poor air quality on the Special Protection Area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16130  Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the impact of poor air quality on the Special Protection Area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/574  Respondent: 10941633 / Kim Hongyin  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to object to Local Plan proposal to build 1,800 houses. I understand there're shortage of housing however by building it at Hog's Back we are losing a beautiful landscape. These are ancient woodland both benefit to local residents and wildlife. I remember when I was recovering from a major surgery, just a short walk from home I spent time every
day walking through the wood for recuperation by looking at calm nature, seeing wildlife and got fresh air. It would be shame and heart breaking to lose this site.

I would like you to reconsider to a different site where you don't DESTROY the natural resources and residents' heart.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
For how long do villagers have to keep fighting? Spending vast amounts on legal and expert advice, including ecologists and air quality experts?

OCKHAM RIPLEY HORSLEY AND SEND WILL NOT GIVE UP THIS FIGHT and you will soon have R H S Wisley redevelopment and improved facilities with this charity attracting half a million more visitors per annum, in turn with an extra half a million car movements per year on the A3 in the Ockham, Ripley, Wisley, M25 Junction 10 areas, albeit not necessarily always at peak time, but for some of the time it will be rush hour, particularly exiting from R H S Wisley

With this there is no possibility of dwellings on the green belt too in this area, no room for people, cars, pollution.

We will all suffer from even poorer air quality too. There will be legal actions against G B C for personal injury. The New Mayor of London is now addressing this problem actively. G B C Please take note. 10,000 people die from poor air quality in London each year.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The Green Belt land in Ockham is included as a strategic site in the G B C draft Local Plan

Its habitat includes Skylarks

Dartford Warblers

Great Crested Newts

Red Kites

Rare plants

Rare butterflies

Snakes

Badgers

Other protected species

Why do Surrey Wildlife Trust maintain the conservation areas, SNCI, SPA Thames Basin conservation areas around Ockham?

Surely this is to preserve the wild life and the green environment

Please visit now the Ockham Common, the Former Wisley Airfield, now Three Farm Meadows

It will look very different to six months ago, green and lush and full of crops and trees rare flowers and wildlife

How can you build on this?
Why are rangers protecting the sites?

We are all protecting the sites in Ockham and surrounding villages in the green belt

And so

Why is G B C not?

I await your comments

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/260  Respondent: 10963137 / Gabrielle Erhardt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the Guildford local plan on the grounds that it fails to address environmental concerns relating to ecological health—the green belt was created as part of a nationwide ecological network providing breathing spaces for nature as well as people—this important network will be fractured by this development.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the over development of this area will significantly increase air pollution from the increased vehicles on the roads which will have detrimental impacts on human health in the area. The greenbelt provides a natural mechanism to mitigate the damage caused by carbon emissions in London. The destruction of the greenbelt in this way will destroy this mechanism.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the over development of this area will significantly increase noise pollution from the increased vehicles on the roads and housing.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that the over development of this green belt area will destroy valuable habits and resources for important species—e.g. the red kite often seen flying over Ripley Green and Barn Owls seen across these areas, to name a few.

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds of mental health. I believe that the green belt provides an important space for people from the city as well as local people to appreciate the beauty of the landscape as well as providing a space to heal. The links between open rural landscape and mental health have been well documented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/262  Respondent: 10963137 / Gabrielle Erhardt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that it will result in a loss of ancient woodland (at Garlicks Arch site) and will therefore result in the loss of native shrubs, rare invertebrates, fungi and many others. Ultimately this will result in the decline in diversity of the local environment.
I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that this development will result in the destruction of hedgerows, which provide very important habitats for the local wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/265  Respondent: 10963137 / Gabrielle Erhardt  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that this development will result in the destruction of hedgerows, which provide very important habitats for the local wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/266  Respondent: 10963137 / Gabrielle Erhardt  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the local plan on the grounds that this development will result in the destruction of hedgerows, which provide very important habitats for the local wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2349  Respondent: 10969249 / Kim Taylor-Peat  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

8) I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/9220</th>
<th>Respondent: 10985057 / Anthony Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY I4 Green and Blue infrastructure – I OBJECT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Policy shows concern for conserving and enhancing biodiversity, which is welcome. I also note and welcome the intention to extend the principle beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. However the current plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will have the opposite effect. The Policy appears therefore to be a box ticking exercise with no real teeth to it. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/3213</th>
<th>Respondent: 11001505 / Greta Edwards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7] I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of the site, in relation to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8] I object to the fact that air quality concerns have all but been ignored. Air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heath SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13952</th>
<th>Respondent: 11012161 / Wendy Gathercole</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of the site, in relation to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/13953</th>
<th>Respondent: 11012161 / Wendy Gathercole</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPP16/12483</td>
<td>Respondent: 11013153 / Peter Carter</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of recreational opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Removing such a large area of local open space, with its associated footpaths and bridleways will reduce the opportunities for people to access the surrounding countryside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The development will have a material impact on local wildlife. This will include the implications for rare plant and bird species as well as deer, who currently regularly access this area of west Guildford through the area around Surrey University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/2467</th>
<th>Respondent: 11014881 / Linda Peters-Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 14 Green and Blue Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan to build on Green Belt and villages will cancel out any benefits of enhancing biodiversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/1854</th>
<th>Respondent: 11015489 / Lorraine Pipe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

9) I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5634  Respondent: 11029409 / John Lay  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously - air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25 /A3 junction,is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17833  Respondent: 11033921 / Tim Depledge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

I object - This policy is totally contravened by the suggestion to build thousands of homes on greenbelt land. Policies A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 and A41- I object to all:

- I can categorically say based on the results of a survey of local West Horsley residents that these developments are not wanted by the existing residents
- There is absolutely no justification for this number of houses to meet the needs of the local. It is clear these sites (with the exception of A36 and A37) are located to maximize profits for landowners and developers targeting commuters to London, not for the benefits of current residents of the Guildford Borough.
  - 19th August 2014, during an interview on the Radio 4 Today Programme, Jeff Fairburn, the Group Chief Executive of Persimmon Homes outlined that building on Green Belt land is significantly profitable for his company, more profitable than building on Brownfield land. This will be the case for all house builders.

  Hence, the Draft Local Plan is allowing development in Green Belt areas, solely at the expense of local residents, generating substantial profits for house builders, without investment in the local community.
  - Furthermore, I note all but two sites within West and East Horsley has been located within approximately 1 mile of the railway station, effectively positioned in "prime commuting area", clearly demonstrating that the location of proposed housing has identified to maximize profits, at the expense of the local communities in which we live.
I note that there is community levy applied to new homes, but, would be very surprised if the small amount of £300 per square meter in the villages is sufficient to provide appropriate infrastructure.

Furthermore, land, when released from the Green Belt increases in value exponentially, generating windfall profits for a small number of individuals, or even corporations, who may not even be resident in the UK.

- The density the housing far exceeds that currently in place in the village settlement. The proposed density of the housing developments is completely out of character with the village of West Just looking at the style of development being built in other locations in high density configurations shows that this will not be in keeping with the community which has existed here for many years, therefore changing the character and sustainability of the location forever.

- The Raleigh School, which is oversubscribed each Over 400 new houses are listed in the Draft Local Plan which will be within close proximity to the school, therefore increasing further the shortage of schooling, and also "gazumping" those who have lived in the village before them.

- The local medical facilities, which are also extremely busy

- The local shopping facilities - there are very limited numbers of shops in West Horsley, and the nearby facilities in East Horsley are extremely busy, again with very limited Congestion will become unsustainable

- All but Site A36 are located the Local Plans designated "Surface Water Hotspot" area, why build on areas of where surface water already builds up, recent newspaper headlines can surely demonstrate this is a bad idea

- West Horsley is treated with disdain by Guildford Borough Council, why is this one small parish subject to a 35% increase in the number of dwellings whereas Guildford (11%) and Ash / Tongham (16%) are much less affected? Could this be because that's where the majority of local councilors live?

- The density proposed will require houses completely out of character with the local environment.

- The pavements in the area are already riddled with potholes and narrow passageways, hence, not appropriate for further expansion

- The existing roads (specifically East Lane) already have such a high number of dangerous pot holes, and these do not get How can it be considered safe to increase the number of houses, and hence increasing the volume of traffic on the roads during construction and occupation when the existing roads are not fit for purpose.

- The local roads and Specifically I would like to draw your attention that the majority of this housing would be required to transition a section of road which is not wide enough for two lanes of marked traffic to pass to travel from West Horsley to Guildford - this seems ridiculous to place hundreds of additional new homes in an area where the roads cannot cope already (the potholes in the Village are already beyond a joke).

- Public Transport - There is very limited public transport in the area beyond the already crowded trains to London and consistently full parking at Horsley

- The local services - for example the local sewerage system is already stretched and East Lane (behind the Manor Farm proposed development) has been subject to significant disruption due to overloading and the natural high water

Therefore, existing facilities are already full to bursting, the roads to Guildford are unable to cope with the increased traffic, and the trains (and parking) are already full, the impact upon the existing community will be detrimental. The development in West Horsley can therefore not be considered as sustainable.

I consider the attack on the community of West Horsley to be unwarranted. No other community in the borough of Guildford has the targeted number of homes.

In the event that growth in the borough is required this should be considered fairly across the borough.

The spatial vision of the Local Plan states:

> This is achieved by maintaining the extent and function of the Green Belt in such a way as to protect the existing character of the borough through maintaining the clear distinction between urban and rural areas and safeguarding the natural, built and historic environment. All new development will be of exemplary design and bring with it the necessary infrastructure and services required to enable future and existing communities to live sustainable lives..... and over 750 dwellings as extensions to existing villages. These dwellings will offer a variety of housing choice in villages and help contribute to supporting local services and the important role they play in village life.

This statement is breached fundamentally by the presumption to end the Green Belt Protection for West and East Horsley. Furthermore, none of the housing plans are accompanied by plans for the necessary infrastructure to support the housing programs. Any sensible person will tell you its necessary to have infrastructure in place before you build houses where people live, otherwise this places an unfair burden on existing residents.
Furthermore, how is it fair on the existing community of West and East Horsley that 2/3 of the 750 village dwellings are focused in this one area?

To summarise, the Draft Local Plan violates enshrined national law regarding the Green Belt, places unsustainable strains on the local services, changes forever

the nature, spirit and feel of the community, generates profits for corporations, a small number of individuals, these funds may not be kept in the UK, and almost certainly will not be reinvested in the local community. Furthermore, the significant majority of housing is for those individuals who do not currently live in the Borough. There are no positives to take from this plan for the local residents of West Horsley, only inconvenience and imposition of irrevocable change.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14162  Respondent: 11036289 / Osman Abdullah  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/674  Respondent: 11048289 / Susanna Harrington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Surrey is a pretty county with important sites of nature and woodland.

These must be protected at all costs for future generations ensuring their well being and sanity. It is being understood more and more that being outside, surrounded by nature, is beneficial to everybody's health and mental well being and that in its turn has a direct impact on doctors' surgeries and hospital queues.

I have a very low opinion of Guildford Borough Council's past performance and its complete inability to maintain the safety of the countryside, to provide properly for the inhabitants. Let's hope some common sense will now prevail and there is a good rethink of the unacceptable GBC Local Plan that has been put before us. I object to it in the strongest terms possible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16316  Respondent: 11058817 / Janet E Sims  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Impact on wildlife in the Wey floodplain and SSSI’s such as adjacent to site A35 the land at the former Wisley Airfield is likely to be severe, there is a rich diversity of wildlife in the area which will be threatened by development on this scale.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8846  Respondent: 11071553 / Nicholas Roberts  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE) – I object, since it can’t be enforced and is anyway contradicted by excessive planned housebuilding in the Green Belt. It does not evaluate the cost of losing Green Belt land and the benefits this currently provides (listed under Policy P2 above).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17749  Respondent: 11071649 / Martin Southcott  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Landscape areas

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14351  Respondent: 11080097 / David & Julia Hunt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting. ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY I object to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that: It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.
Conservation value of the site is protected or improved.

GREEN BELT SITES

I object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.” This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are tired of repeating the same comments as it appears to be a waste of time and effort. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.13 All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2918  Respondent: 11086433 / Colin Carmichael  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

8) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

9) I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4688  Respondent: 11096897 / Rob Workman  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Furthermore, the plan diminishes the rural character of the Horsleys and reduces flora and fauna habitats.

I hope that my views and concerns will be considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11847  Respondent: 11153313 / Milena Nicholas  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The proposal to increase the size of village boundaries

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17153  Respondent: 11659905 / Thakeham Homes (Anthony Heslehurst)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Representations Relating to Policy I4 ‘Green and Blue Infrastructure’

Thakeham objects to the proposed designation of the site as ‘Open Space’ and the findings of the Council’s Assessment of Sites for Amenity Value document which has informed the designation.

Open Space is defined in the NPPF as follows:

“All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity”

With respect to open space designations in the Pre Submission Plan, Policy I4 states the following:

“Open space (encompassing all open space within urban areas, land designated as Open Space on the Policies Map and all land and water that provides opportunities for recreation and sport) will be protected from development in accordance with the NPPF.”

Pre Submission Local Plan, Policy I4, Page 119

At supporting Paragraph 4.6.55 of the ‘Reasoned Justification’, the Council explain that the identification of Open Spaces has been informed by the Amenity Assessment evidence base document:

“The Council has produced an Amenity Assessment to identify open spaces of public amenity value within villages that are inset from the Green Belt by the plan. This assessment looked at land within proposed village inset boundaries, excluding land where inset boundaries were expanded to take in allocations on the edges of villages. Sites that were assessed as having public value that would be harmed by development are identified as Open Space on the Policies Map and will be protected in line with the NPPF. Open spaces outside inset village boundaries are protected by the Green Belt designation so have not been considered for further protection. Land of public value in the inset villages that is used for sport and recreation is identified through the Open Space Sport and Recreation Study and will be protected in line with the NPPF.” Pre Submission Local Plan, Paragraph 4.6.55

Following a site visit and basic desktop assessment, the Amenity Assessment deemed that the site (GIS Ref. ETH_088) had an amenity value score of ‘High’, accompanied by the following reasoning:

“Site is a grass field which is inaccessible to the public. The site is adjacent to a private sports centre. There is also Public Right of Way along the southern boundary. The site is in an elevated position and offers aesthetic value” Amenity Assessment, Page 118, Site Ref. ETH_088

As the site is private land which is inaccessible to the public and therefore has no amenity value with respect to providing opportunities for sports and recreation, it appears that the site has been designated entirely due to its ‘aesthetic value’ and that as a result the overall amenity value is scored as ‘High’. This is the only basis upon which the site is designated an Open Space within the Pre Submission Local Plan under Policy I4.

The site is well contained by high hedgerow to its southern boundaries adjacent to the public footpath, and is set substantially back from the road frontage of Chinthurst Lane. Due to the location and positioning of the site, there are very limited views towards the site from the public realm on Chinthurst Lane and further afield. The only views into the land are from private properties at first floor level, or from the private sports club. Which although begin adjacent has not been identified within this policy.
To demonstrate the minimal visual amenity value of this site, we have appended a series of images at Appendix 2. These images show that the site is not visible from the public footpath, with the exception of over the entrance gate, and that there is very limited visibility towards the site from the public realm on Chinthurst Lane.

We object to the conclusion within the Amenity Assessment that this site is of high amenity value and we consider that the proposed allocation of the land as Open Space should be removed from the Local Plan.

The designation of sites of no amenity value is not consistent with the NPPF and does not constitute positive planning and would seriously compromise the ability of the Borough to provide much needed housing in sustainable locations within the villages and towns.

For the reasons above, it is our view that the Council should review the evidence basis, including the Amenity Assessment, and that the proposed Open Space allocation affecting this site should be removed to ensure that the plan reflects national planning policy.

This site is set within a highly sustainable location in the village, and would be suitable for residential development in the emerging plan period.

Availability

The NPPG provides the following guidance in regard to considering whether a site is available for development:

“A site is considered available for development, when, on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems, such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips tenancies or operation requirements of landowners. This will often mean that land is controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop” NPPG Paragraph 021 Ref. 3-020-20140306

As highlighted within this representation, the site is controlled by Thakeham Homes Ltd and we will be actively engaging with the council over the coming months prior to submission of a full planning application for residential development.

Thakeham has a proven track record for delivering a number of high quality residential schemes across Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire and will be seeking to deliver circa 20 dwellings on the site with a view to commencing development on site at the earliest opportunity.

[Note: The respondent has advised that the above paragraph contains an error and should be amended as follows: “Thakeham has a proven track record for delivering a number of high quality residential schemes across Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire and will be seeking to deliver circa 200 dwellings on the site with a view to commencing development on site at the earliest opportunity.”]

Suitability

The NPPG provides the following guidance when considering whether a site is suitable for development:

“Sites in existing development plans or with planning permission will generally be considered suitable for development although it may be necessary to assess whether circumstances have changed which would alter their suitability” NPPG Paragraph 019 Ref. 019-20140306

The site lies within the village of Shalford which is proposed to be inset from the Green Belt. In addition, the site was found to be a suitable location for residential development within the LAA.

The site is also located on the edge of the settlement and is surrounding by existing residential and commercial development on all of its boundaries. There are a number of services and facilities in the local area, including a railway station and an infant school. Physical constraints to development in this location are also minimal. The site lies comfortably within Flood Risk Zone 1, where there is considered to be the lowest level of fluvial flood risk. There are no major ecology constraints and the site lies a significant distance from the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.

Achievability

In determining whether a site is achievable for development, the NPPF provides the following guidance:
“A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of the site and the capacity of the developer to complete and let or sell the development over a certain period” NPPG, Paragraph 021 Ref. 021-20140306

Given the acute housing need within the Borough and the relative lack of constraint affecting this site, it is considered that there is a reasonable prospect of residential development being achieved on site by 2021.

As stated above, Thakeham has a proven track record for delivering schemes of a similar size and scale throughout Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire, and has the capacity to deliver the development of the site to provide much needed new homes within the first 5 years of the plan period.

Deliverability

For the reasons above, the site is considered to be available, suitable and achievable, and therefore deliverable in accordance with the NPPG. In summary, we consider that this site has minimal or no amenity value and should not be designated as Open Space, and that the site is deliverable for residential development in the meaning of the NPPG.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 2016 07 18 GBC Pre Submission LP Representations Chinthurst Lane Appendix 1.pdf (382 KB)
2016 07 18 GBC Pre Submission LP Representations Chinthurst Lane Appendix 2.pdf (1.2 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17222  Respondent: 11832961 / The National Trust - London and SE (Rachel Botcherby)
Agent: Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We support this policy in principle and the Trust welcomes the specific reference to the River Wey and our planning guidelines in the supporting text. However, the Trust’s main focus is less about the type of development, residential or commercial, but that any development is mindful of and respects the historic character of the river corridor in terms of scale, design, materials, lighting, location and impact on the water table and the structural integrity of the Navigations.

We note from Appendix E that the Council are proposing that the adoption of Policy I4 will supersede Policy G11 relating specifically to the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations. The National Trust object to this approach and will strongly resist the loss of Policy G11.

We request that either Policy I4 is updated to include the National Trusts Planning Guidelines or the policy considerations listed in the current Local Plan Policy G11, namely that:

“Development within the River Wey Navigations corridor, as defined on the Proposals Map, will be permitted provided that:

• It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;
• The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;
• Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;
• Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.
• The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved”.

Alternatively, reference to Policy G11 being superseded is removed from Appendix E, leaving Policy G11 in place and extant, until such time as the Council commence work on its Development Management Policies Document. The Trust would be happy to work with the Council to ensure that a suitably worded River Wey Navigations specific policy is included in this document to ensure its long term protection and enhancement as a key heritage asset not just to Guildford
but also reflecting its national significance as one of the earliest waterways to be made navigable which, when combined
with the Godalming Navigation, currently forms the most southerly operational navigations of the inland waterway
network in Britain.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4795  **Respondent:** 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

35  **POLICY I4 GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE**

35.1  **I object** to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure.

35.2  This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green
Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the
principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

35.3  There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens
play in a village setting.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/4796  **Respondent:** 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

36  **ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY**

36.1  **I object** to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The
existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will
only be permitted provided that:

36.1.1  It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming
Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;

36.1.2  The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;

36.1.3  Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;

36.1.4  Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.

36.1.5  The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Page 95 of 146
Comment ID: PSLPP16/85  Respondent: 15101793 / Julia Goddard  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object to the 2016 draft for building houses in Wisley, Clandon, Send. I would like to enjoy my childhood of being able to roam about the countryside without the negative impact of large numbers of housing being built
I would like to learn about nature and wildlife and sustain what we have in these areas.
Greenbelt is very important to me in the areas of Wisley, Clandon, Burpham. Garlicks arch is just across from where I Live and I enjoy walking my dogs there.
I am going to Clandon School and I object to the houses being built there.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/121  Respondent: 15106689 / Joseph Hine  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. As a keen runner I object the the inclusion of the Large strategic sites at Wisley airfield and Garlicks Arch due to the inevitable deterioration in air quality that will ensue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8954  Respondent: 15107297 / Ian McQuattie  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):
• No teeth. Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2818  Respondent: 15109537 / Elizabeth Alexander  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
8) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

9) I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4520  Respondent: 15127777 / Keith Hammond  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Wildlife corridor

The developments A38, A39, A40 and A41 will have a significant impact on wildlife movement. Open areas are being boxed in between A41 and A39 and the railway line. A38 removes the link between the open areas on one side of it and the open area the other side of East Lane. Currently only one row of houses exists which forms a very limited barrier to wildlife. The development of A38 will make a solid barrier. The same is true for the open countryside either side of A40

Water pressure

The water pressure in East Lane is demonstrably poor. I also understand that the waste systems are struggling to cope. As the Local Plan is proposing a 35% increase in housing in West Horsley this, surely, is taking these facilities way past their breaking point.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/484  Respondent: 15141761 / Louise Jelly  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This site would be protected under birds and habitats directives. Wildlife and land would be harmed by development proposed.

This is an area of outstanding natural beauty.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/487  Respondent: 15141793 / Paul Peters  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This site would be protected under birds and habitats directives. Wildlife and land would be harmed by development proposed.

This is an area of outstanding natural beauty.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/552  Respondent: 15144545 / Stacey Maxwell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Impact on environment
   Destroying the Green Belt and beautiful greenery/woodlands in these historic villages around the strategic sites will have a catastrophic effect on wildlife and the environment. This is completely UNACCEPTABLE and there appears to be no consideration for issues these developments will cause the conservation areas or Special Protection Areas. For this reason, I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development proposed in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/774  Respondent: 15157537 / Elizabeth Ravenhill  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The lack of consideration for wildlife that live in the woods and fields in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/899  Respondent: 15176769 / C McCleery  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Local and national celebrations are held there e.g. Queen's Birthday, village days or more. It provides sports facilities - cricket, football, tennis, kiddies playground and gymnastic equipment and a cycling track. Many people use this place to walk their dogs. All this makes Kingston Meadows a very important social asset and is important to village life.

This should be preserved and kept in the Green Belt to keep it safe for the future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/1219  Respondent: 15206721 / Beverly Saidman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

2. I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5100  Respondent: 15227329 / Sharon Pask  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously - air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1385  Respondent: 15227585 / Kelly Bartlett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously - air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously - air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

I object to the fact that proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village's green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):
• No teeth. Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously - air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village's green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the inadequate protection of the environment.

I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the harm that will be caused to the Special Protection Area, the Sites of Special Scientific Interest and the borough's Conservation Area and heritage assets.

I object to the impact of poor air quality on the Special Protection Area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
20. I object to the inadequate protection of the environment.

21. I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the harm that will be caused to the Special Protection Area, the Sites of Special Scientific Interest and the borough's Conservation Area and heritage assets.

22. I object to the impact of poor air quality on the Special Protection Area.

23. I object to the erosion of the Green Belt in clear contravention of the Government's and Conservative councillors' election manifesto promises to protect the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

In particular, I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt (Policy P2) as Send provides a buffer between Woking and Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

29. I object to the impact that additional residents will have on local roads, health services, education spaces and policing needs.

30. I object to the failure of Guildford Borough Council to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 in the Local Plan and to find sufficient brownfield sites for development prior to considering sites within the Green Belt.

[Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
7 I object to the damage that would be caused by the proposed plan to the wildlife and the ancient woodland with the old oak trees.

8 I object to development in areas which are at risk of flooding. The area at Garlicks Arch has flooded many times in the past and is therefore at greater risk.

9 I object to not protecting the green belt.

10 I object to the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon being removed from the green belt as there are no exceptional circumstances to remove these villages from the green belt.

I wish my objections to be taken into consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1754  Respondent: 15244641 / Wesley Raynbird-Tilbury  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4 Green and blue infrastructure

I OBJECT. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan's onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1816  Respondent: 15247265 / Aileen Aitcheson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4 Green and blue infrastructure

I support this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/1840  Respondent: 15247745 / Brian Aitcheson Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY 14 Green and blue infrastructure

I support this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1848  Respondent: 15248321 / Gordon Pipe Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

8) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

9) I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1859  Respondent: 15248449 / Peter Bessler Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

8) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

9) I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in these areas are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1885  Respondent: 15253313 / J.J. Maguire Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the loss of habitat for wild animals. I have observed a decrease in the years (28) that I have lived here. development on the scale that is proposed will put further pressure on the fauna.

1. I object because of the pollution that so much additional traffic will generate. I have asthma and moved out of London to improve my health. This increase in vehicle emissions will be bad for my health.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/1927  Respondent: 15254305 / Ben Barnwell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

8) I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

9) I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/2158  Respondent: 15268545 / Ivan Gale  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to lack of protection for heritage and environmental assets, particularly wildlife diversity, loss of habitat and our green and pleasant county.

2. I object to the obsession with economic growth over quality of life which will blight the areas proposed for development, again this is greed not need.

3. I object to the impact these developments will have on neighbouring areas such as Pyrford, which has not been taken into account[Ivan and Carole].

4. I object to the fullscale abuse of Surrey’s peace and beauty.

5. I object to the Conservative Council who said they would protect Green Belt, but they lied.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/12439  Respondent: 15273377 / Tracey Geaves  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the obsession with economic growth over quality of life which will blight the areas proposed for development, again this is greed not need.

2. I object to the impact these developments will have on neighbouring areas such as Pyrford, which has not been taken into account[Ivan and Carole].

3. I object to the fullscale abuse of Surrey’s peace and beauty.

4. I object to the Conservative Council who said they would protect Green Belt, but they lied.
I am writing regarding Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure.

I would like to suggest that allotments be specifically included in the list of green and blue infrastructure. Allotments meet the needs of relaxation, exercise, recreation, visual amenity, wildlife habitat and agriculture just as much, if not more, than the parks, open spaces, private gardens, agricultural fields and woodland listed so should certainly be included. They are a valuable resource for local communities and should be given the same recognition and protection as other open spaces.

I have only had an allotment since April but have already seen a great deal of wildlife at the site, including seeing a hedgehog from just a couple of feet away, the first one I have seen living wild in my 36 years. I am already reasonably fit and healthy but in the four months I have had my plot I have been much more active and am eating a wider variety of fruits and vegetables. I live on Barrack Road and know a few of my neighbours, but there is not much of a community so it has been really nice to meet fellow plot holders at the allotments who share similar interests and feel part of a welcoming and supportive community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2499  **Respondent:** 15275009 / Compton Parish Council (Fiona Curtis)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This policy is confusing. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting. Land designated as 'open space' appears to be protected whereas land that IS actually open space (ie Blackwell Farm, Wisley, Gosden Hill and Normandy strategic sites) is proposed for development?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/2401  **Respondent:** 15280321 / Sport England (Owen Neal)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

Sport England supports that the Council's intention to protect existing outdoor sports facilities in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework within Policy I4.

However, Sport England recommends that a separate policy or reference is required within the Green and Blue Infrastructure policy to cover outdoor and indoor sports facilities. This is because where it is proposed that these facilities are lost to make way for other forms of development, the reprovision of sports infrastructure can be more complex than it is for some other forms of green infrastructure. In seeking to protect sport facilities Sport England will refer to our Playing Fields Policy – Planning Policy Statement: A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England see: https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/

Our Playing Fields Policy reflects the wording of Section 74 (see Exception 4 and 5).
Sport England also considers that the Council should do additional work to plan for new sports facilities in line with the guidance in Paragraph 73 of the NPPF which states:

“Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreational facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.”

Without a robust assessment of need in place in the form of an up-to-date PPS, there is no evidence that new leisure, recreational and cultural facilities are required. Therefore, whilst Sport England supports the provision of new facilities, there is a risk that any policy may be open to challenge and deemed unsound on the basis that it is not fully justified.

With regards to the provision of new infrastructure and facilities, Sport England would require a contribution to both sports pitches and the built provision of sports facilities to meet the increased demand caused by the additional population. Sport England’s Sports Facilities Calculator (SFC) is a very sophisticated planning tool which helps to estimate the level of demand for key community sports facilities that is created by a given population. The SFC has been created by Sport England to help local planning authorities quantify how much additional demand for the key community sports facilities (swimming pools, sports halls and synthetic turf pitches), is generated by populations of new growth, development and regeneration areas. It uses information Sport England has gathered on who uses facilities and applies this to the actual population profile of the local area. This ensures that the calculation is sensitive to the needs of the people who actually live there. Further information on the SFC can be found on our website at:

http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/sports_facility_calculator.aspx

Sport England’s Planning Policy Objective 8 ‘Providing for Sport through New Development’:

“To promote the use of planning obligations as a way of securing the provision of new or enhanced places for sport and a contribution towards their future maintenance, to meet the needs arising from new development.”

Again, these facilities should include existing open space, sports and recreational building and land as stated within paragraph 74 of the NPPF. However, without a robust assessment of need in place in the form of an up-to-date PPS which clearly identifies shortfalls in provision, there is a risk that this policy could not be justified and deemed unsound. Further, without such an up to date strategy, it would be difficult to determine specific proposals through the development management process in line with the council’s local policy. Sport England therefore objects to Policy I4.

Sport England support the view on the dual use of sites, in particular the extended use of school sites for the benefit of the community. Sport England has developed a toolkit regarding accessing schools for community use which may be of use, available via the below link:

http://www.sportengland.org/support__advice/opening_schools.aspx

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):

• Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The green belt is essential to maintain an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure pursuits can flourish. This is exactly what has happened here and with the ever increasing outward pressure from London, it is even more important that the countryside is preserved for all to enjoy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1) I object to the loss of green fields, trees and hedgerows to make way for the buildings and associated new roads which will destroy the visual beauty of the area.

2) I object to the destruction of areas that are currently home to natural flora and fauna displacing animals and birds.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.
There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14234  Respondent: 15299201 / Samira Abdullah  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

I object to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that: It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest; The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved; Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved; Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations. The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved; GREEN BELT SITES I object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan! object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.” This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are tired of repeating the same comments as it appears to be a waste of time and effort. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.13 All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3460  Respondent: 15320737 / Steven Brown  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to POLICY I4 Green and blue infrastructure

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
• No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.
• All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/3893  Respondent: 15349505 / C Erhardt  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to destruction of important habitats and ancient woodlands.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5639  Respondent: 15349505 / C Erhardt  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to destruction of important habitats and ancient woodlands.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4035  Respondent: 15352065 / Daniel Sinclair  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposed boundary changes would devastate the only open green communal area in East Horsley, Kingston meadows and other boundary changes are ridiculous in that they ignore natural boundaries which exist and are currently used (such as a deep drainage ditch) and would seek to move these to further the machinations of the developers. The arguments for the boundary changes are therefore invalid.

By changing the boundary to include area past the A246..and infilling in the spaces, you are threatening the green belt in the same way as new developments and I view this with the same scepticism and unless the boundary changes can be lawfully justified, they are invalid too.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Friends of Normandy Wildlife (FNW) strongly object to eight points in the Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites, June 2016 (the Plan). These are:

• The late inclusion of A46 in the Plan
• Errors in the Evidence Base regarding Settlement Hierarchy and Settlement Profile of Normandy and Flexford
• Non-compliance by GBC with Policy 14
• The proposed development in Normandy and Flexford (Site A46)
• The proposed development in Flexford (Site A47)
• The Transport Strategy in relation to Normandy and Flexford
• The urban density of housing proposed for A46 and Policy 04
• The insetting of Normandy and Flexford (Policy P2)

FNW object because we believe the Plan to be unsound and unsustainable and does not therefore meet the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposed development represents a serious encroachment on the Green Belt and would have a significant and deleterious impact on biodiversity and the natural environment including wildlife. These are factors which are highlighted as important in National, County and Borough Council policies relating to planning, yet they have been completely ignored within the Local Plan.

In view of the fact that the proposed development (A46) was put into the Plan after the Regulation 18 consultations in 2013/14 and not published until April 2016 in the Draft Local Plan, residents of Normandy Parish have not had a previous occasion on which to comment upon it. FNW have attempted to address this omission in this response, in so far as the proposed development impacts upon wildlife and wildlife habitats (flora and fauna), both on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, and on the countryside which will be enveloped by this development. This may mean that our response combines a Regulation 18 and a Regulation 19 submission.

In our submission, we demonstrate the major significance of Normandy and Flexford for biodiversity, wildlife and nature conservation with its nationally important sites for nature conservation within and adjoining the parish. We highlight the serious detrimental effects the development will have on these areas, and illustrate how the planning proposals (with particular reference to Policies A46, A47 and the Transport Strategy) directly conflict with National planning policies and Guildford Borough Council’s own interpretation of these.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4904  Respondent: 15380289 / Stephen Hewlett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. No consideration of the harm that will be done to special protection areas, sites of special scientific interest’s and conservation area and Heritage asset’s

I object to the proposal strategic SANG allocation at Long Reach west Horsley for close on 1,000 new houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/4932  Respondent: 15380289 / Stephen Hewlett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to increases in traffic as the air quality will be compromised and could possibly have a bad effect on residents health in the future. The local doctor's surgery may not be able to cope with such a large influx of new patients from new housing developments - on occasions it is difficult to get an appointment for several days and in some instances there is a wait of up to 10 days.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5416  Respondent: 15391905 / Geoff Gear  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to increases in traffic as the air quality will be compromised and could possibly have a bad effect on residents health in the future. The local doctor's surgery may not be able to cope with such a large influx of new patients from new housing developments - on occasions it is difficult to get an appointment for several days and in some instances there is a wait of up to 10 days.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5546  Respondent: 15400385 / Robert Bonnar  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• The area is a haven for wildlife, some of which is already endangered. The introduction of residences would mean the import into an ecologically sensitive area not only of humans and their increased footfall, but also of
pets, and cats and dogs in particular, that can have a devastating effect on wildlife. Protected species on and near the site and wildlife corridors would be destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/5804  Respondent: 15407809 / Valerie Platt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

7] Seventhly I object to the early exhibition of a SANG in Longreach, West Horsley by a Company, Greenreach Ltd, which is totally owned by developers. How dare the GBC support the concept of this exhibition when we have many wonderful areas of country for recreation? To put this artificial plan forward before the Local Plan has completed its consultation is disgraceful, especially since it has been created by Developers who clearly expect the GBC to favour them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6916  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to A35 Wisley former airfield and A44 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send on the grounds of their adverse impact on local wildlife. There are numerous species of Dragonfly at Boldermere/Wisley Lake, also the rare "wasp" spider, and both Beautiful and Banded Demoiselle Damselflies on the River Wey Navigation, as well as many species of both smaller and larger wildlife which would be adversely impacted by these developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10684  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to A35 Wisley former airfield and A44 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send on the grounds of their adverse impact on local wildlife. There are numerous species of Dragonfly at Boldermere/Wisley Lake, also the rare "wasp" spider, and both Beautiful and Banded Demoiselle Damselflies on the River Wey Navigation, as well as many species of both smaller and larger wildlife which would be adversely impacted by these developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/6797  Respondent: 15438945 / Jacqueline Davies  Agent:

I object to A35 Wisley former airfield and A44 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send on the grounds of their adverse impact on local wildlife. There are numerous species of Dragonfly at Boldermere/Wisley Lake, also the rare "wasp" spider, and both Beautiful and Banded Demoiselle Damselflies on the River Wey Navigation, as well as many species of both smaller and larger wildlife which would be adversely impacted by these developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to POLICY I4 Green and blue infrastructure

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
- No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.
- All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to POLICY 14 Green and blue infrastructure

- Infrastructure considered here as an afterthought, rather than pre-condition of development. Should be a key issue for the rest of the plan.
- Excessive housebuilding in countryside not supported by any funding or provision for infrastructure.
- Heavy focus on building on greenfield sites inefficient and unnecessary: cheap for developers but much more expensive for the public who have to fund the infrastructure.
- Draft CIL scale discourages use of brownfield land first.
- No plan for organic increase in existing traffic congestion, let alone once thousands of houses are built across the countryside. Local roads hardly considered. Green Belt being eroded before road widening/improvement plans certain, encouraging over-development of greenfield sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7759</th>
<th>Respondent: 15451969 / Rosie Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the local plan based on the impact it will have on the special countryside of the borough.

The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch (A43) will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/7833</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454625 / Paul Woy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I cannot see how any proposal for Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space can possibly mitigate the damage caused to the natural habitats of the bats, ground nesting birds, invertebrates, reptiles and flora and fauna by additional residents and their pets. It remains very uncertain how this can be controlled.

A development of this scale will have a huge impact on light and noise pollution which will affect both local residents and wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17362</th>
<th>Respondent: 15460737 / Donna Collinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We welcome this policy.

We propose that “slow the flow” and sustainable drainage schemes, intended to reduce flood risk, should be considered as also contributing to blue green infrastructure due to their wider benefits.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8100  Respondent: 15461217 / S. Gilby  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to damage that will be done to local wildlife.

The National Planning Policy Framework allows the overall housing target to be reduced to take account of protected wildlife areas. The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are Y- protected. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. I am not aware that any wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8450  Respondent: 15466177 / D.L. + E.J. Wilkinson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY 14 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):

• No Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/8536  Respondent: 15469217 / L.Y. Jolliffe  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Is the Council going to set up Low Emission Zones to counter this and meet anti-pollution legislation? As an asthmatic who only recently moved to this area, I am seriously concerned.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8545</th>
<th>Respondent: 15470305 / E C McQuade</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I currently have a field behind my house full of wildlife including deer and hundreds of year’s old oak trees. Even with this open space the ground in my garden has problems with slow drainage of surface water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8577</th>
<th>Respondent: 15471489 / P Gilby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to damage that will be done to local wildlife. The National Planning Policy Framework allows the overall housing target to be reduced to take account of protected wildlife areas. The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. I am not aware that any wildlife report has been conducted on the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8721</th>
<th>Respondent: 15475041 / Anne Geary</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support this policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/8955</th>
<th>Respondent: 15478017 / Kirstie Pankhurst</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN &amp; BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No teeth. Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to Policy I4 Green and Blue Infrastructure

The policy appears therefore to be a box-ticking exercise with no real teeth to it.

There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land. “The natural world, its biodiversity and its constituent ecosystems are critically important to our well being and economic prosperity, but are consistently undervalued in conventional economic analyses and decision-making” (Biodiversity 2020 page 11) “As a public authority in England you have a duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of your policy or decision making.” (Government Planning Guidance)

I have some concerns that “enhancing” the River Wey in the town centre will avoid using the available brownfield land around Walnut Tree Close and Slyfield for urban regeneration and sustainable housing that could otherwise be used. It is noted that the largest areas of industrial brownfield land within the borough are near to or adjacent to the River Wey, particularly in the Walnut Tree Close area and in the Slyfield industrial area and could support much more housing than the relatively small numbers indicated in the policy on the town centre, under a town centre regeneration scheme. This would have huge benefits for the community as a whole since relatively run down areas would be subject to regeneration, the river banks would be cleaner and more attractive. John Rigg of Savills and Guildford Vision Group indicated to the GBC Scrutiny Committee that initial commercial projections indicated that the Walnut Tree Close area alone could provide 4000 homes. This is significantly in excess of the current GBC proposals. Both Allies & Morrison and GVG initially indicated that they believed that this site could be available for regeneration within the critical 5 year window required for the local plan.

It is important that the desire for Green and Blue infrastructure does not become an excuse for preventing regeneration of Walnut Tree Close. Such a regeneration zone would be highly sustainable, because it would be within 1 mile of the railway station, adjacent to the A3, and would eliminate an area of huge congestion in the town because if the industrial sites were replaced by housing then the residents would commute by train or walk to work rather than having to drive in to an industrial estate.

Responses to policy notes:
4.6.33 Villages are generally permeable to wildlife. The lower density of housing and presence of gardens (especially larger gardens) provides a corridor for movement across the residential area. Insetting of villages and the relaxation of planning restrictions in the Green Belt implied by Policy P2 will lead to infilling, “garden grabbing” and consequent loss of biodiversity. It will replace connections and corridors between habitats with barriers and lead to further fragmentation of our natural infrastructure.

Responses to definitions
4.6.42 “Biodiversity creation and/or enhancement” is not a definition – it requires definition. The points made are aspirational that have no enforcement to back them. Building on the countryside and increasing the population by such a large amount will not help vulnerable species. It will put added pressure on remaining habitats and increase light and air pollution, degrading the ability of the borough to support wildlife.

4.6.43 Arrangements with developers have no guarantee of success or longevity. They involve partial mitigation and overall loss of the original biodiversity interest of a site.

4.6.45 In the desperation to find SANG land Guildford Borough Council are making use of existing open space that will not attract people away from the SPA and ignores the impact on existing wildlife. In allocating sites as SANG, GBC has ignored the requirement to consider existing biodiversity and clearly have little or any knowledge or understanding of the issue. The issues relating to Russell Place Farm have been pointed out by a qualified Biologist. Many invertebrates are dependent on the dung of grazing animals and this aspect of our countryside is being steadily driven out of our Borough.
Key Evidence
Guildford Borough Policy Statements are statements – not evidence
Additional evidence should include:

- Existing SNCI surveys, including those that took place in 2004-2007.
- Biodiversity evidence emerging from Neighbourhood Plans.
- Evidence obtained by requests to local naturalists and natural history societies including those with a specialist interest.

Monitoring
Simply maintaining open space will not be enough for a significantly enlarged population. Providing more open space to meet existing shortfalls or the needs of a much larger population will reduce the area of land currently in food production or providing wildlife habitat. SANG delivery is harming existing biodiversity. It is not clear how you will measure a change in biodiversity just by looking at planning applications. "Net gains in biodiversity provided by development" is a contradiction in terms. There is no guarantee that mitigations listed in an application will be carried out and their effectiveness is not guaranteed either. GBC would need to carry out follow-up ecological surveys on all sites. The approach being taken is one that intends to make no net gain, and possibly even reduce, sites of nature conservation interest – in contradiction to the stated aims. If an existing SNCI (or one proposed on grounds of biodiversity but not formally accepted in a Local Plan) is found to be in poor condition the action taken should be to bring it back into good condition – not to remove its status and build on it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9701  Respondent: 15485409 / Barry & Janet Oakley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

No protection of any wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9720  Respondent: 15485537 / Paul Hatton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I feel that there has been insufficient consideration of SPA, SSI and any Conservation Area issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/9737  Respondent: 15485601 / Tim Jewers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to insufficient consideration of the Thames Basin SPA, SSSI, SNCI sites and conservation areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13820  Respondent: 15495361 / Therese Elizabeth Hill  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is not enough provision of open spaces around the villages of Ripley, Send Wisley and Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/10053  Respondent: 15495873 / Gerard Duvé  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Green and Blue Infrastructure. : I support this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11091  Respondent: 15509057 / Richard Golding  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

I OBJECT. This policy must be a box ticking exercise, it totally ignores the fact that the local plan is just a policy to concrete over large area of agricultural land, with global warming happening this land will be required for food production.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11298  Respondent: 15570145 / Owen Eszeki  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Policy I4 - Green and Blue Infrastructure.
I support this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11291  Respondent: 15570209 / Emily Cross  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4 - Green and Blue Infrastructure.

I support this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11468  Respondent: 15571425 / Monika Neczaj  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):

• Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11494  Respondent: 15571553 / Darren Carbine  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY I4 Green and blue infrastructure - I OBJECT.

The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11661  Respondent: 15573921 / Carolyne Jackson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This Green Belt was implemented for a reason, to protect from urban sprawl, to ensure Green spaces for generations to come not just for our generation. The Green Belt is not just for the people who live in the villages but for Londoners too for their health and their mental well being. There are plenty of other places to build that are more suitable, this seems to me to be a corrupt way for someone to make money at the expense and misery of everyone else not just for today but for the children and the wildlife of the future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/11899  Respondent: 15576641 / Hilary Thomas  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The impact on wild life will be very detrimental too and as for the infrastructure of medical and schools provision necessary, has it really been thought out. A & E departments have closed in local hospitals, so ambulance journeys to A & E are now longer and they don’t need traffic congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/18729  Respondent: 15579457 / RSPB South East Office (Heather Richards)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the plan (paragraph/policy/map/table) does this comment relate?

Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure

Do you consider this section of the plan is legally compliant? Yes
Do you consider this section of the plan is sound? Yes
Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to cooperate? Yes

RSPB Comment:
The RSPB welcomes the inclusion of policy I4. In particular we welcome the stated intention that the current and potential biodiversity of land outside Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) will be considered. We also welcome the commitment to produce a Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document. (para 4.6.35)

There appears to be a cross-referencing error in para 4.6.37, which refers to policy “I5”, but no such policy exists. Should this be a reference to policy P5 instead?

The RSPB welcomes the proposal that open space, including SANGs within or adjacent to the BOAs will be designed and managed to support the aims of the BOA. However, it will be important to ensure that SANGs’ primary role as mitigation is not compromised by this work. The RSPB considers that in general increasing the biodiversity of a SANG is likely to increase its attractiveness to the public, but it is important that if there is any potential conflict between mitigation and biodiversity enhancement this should be resolved in favour of the mitigation role. In addition it is essential
that sites that are already important for wildlife are not selected as SANGs due to the immediate conflict between conservation and recreation.

**What changes do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Correct the apparent cross-referencing error highlighted above.

Add a sentence making it clear that the mitigation function of SANG will be prioritised where there is a potential conflict with biodiversity enhancement measures.

*If you are proposing a change to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites, do you wish to express an interest in participating at the Examination?* No.

*Why do you wish to participate at the Examination?*

*What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?*

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPP16/12961  **Respondent:** 15586017 / C Maslin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?* ( ), *is Sound?* ( ), *is Legally Compliant?* ( )

**POLICY I4 GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE**

I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure.

This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

**ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY**

I object to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that:

- It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;
- The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;
- Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;
- Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.
- The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved.

**GREEN BELT SITES**

I object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan.
I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that ‘allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.’ This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are tired of repeating the same comments as it appears to be a waste of time and effort. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.13

All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until 'exceptional circumstances' for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/13585  Respondent: 15593633 / Ila-Maria Paternmann  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We strongly believe in protecting our environment, being members of the Surrey Wildlife Trust and think our heritage assets and wildlife need protection to counterbalance the effects of global warming and environmental changes that are already creating weather events across the UK and locally that have a very negative impact on people around us nearly every year now. We therefore object to the site A45 The Talbot, the A57 The Paddocks and the site A43 Garlick's Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14277  Respondent: 15601953 / Stephen Yandle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- No teeth. Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14352  Respondent: 15602177 / Julia Hunt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a
village setting. ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY

I object to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that: It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest; The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved; Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved; Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations. The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved.

GREEN BELT SITES

I object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.” This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are tired of repeating the same comments as it appears to be a waste of time and effort. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.13 All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/14514  Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE): • Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

I OBJECT TO the lack of provision for new schools.

I OBJECT TO the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16286  Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE): • Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

I OBJECT TO the lack of provision for new schools.

I OBJECT TO the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/14836  Respondent: 15607937 / Joanna Kaminska-Hine  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to inclusion of the strategic sites as I feel these would be detrimental to the environment in an already polluted area due to its proximity to M25 road network

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15425  Respondent: 15614497 / Hannah Yandle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE):
• No teeth. Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15668  Respondent: 15618881 / Jayne Barmby  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting. There is no mention of the impact of the plan on food production, or monitoring the loss of agricultural land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17926  Respondent: 15618881 / Jayne Barmby  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to I4 - green and blue infrastructure particularly the sites in East and West Horsley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPP16/15716  Respondent: 15619041 / Jack Cross  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy I4 - Green and Blue Infrastructure.

I support this policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15755  Respondent: 15623745 / Stella May  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure. This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting. ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY I object to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that: It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations. The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15930  Respondent: 15627105 / Julia McClung  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/ A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15934  Respondent: 15627137 / Katie McClung  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPP16/15989  Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Education

Since the previous consultation on the Draft Local Plan: strategy and sites in July 2014, we have been working with borough council officers under the Duty to Cooperate in order to progress the approach to school provision to support the delivery of Guildford’s growth strategy. This liaison is ongoing and both our councils recognise that it is essential to provide additional school places to meet the increased needs that will arise from the new housing proposed in the emerging Local Plan in a sustainable way and in appropriate locations.

The county council’s role in this process has been to respond to options for school sites, presented by the borough council, in accordance with the objective of meeting the additional educational demands based on the evidence of forecasted need produced by the county council’s schools commissioning team. The key criteria for selection were the location of sites, which need to be as close as possible to the residential development they are intended to serve, and the provision of safe and sustainable access for pupils that, where possible, enables alternatives to car travel.

We are concerned about the designation of all school playing fields as open space. It is inferred in paragraph 4.6.38 of the Local Plan that these areas will be accessible to the public, whereas access and shared use of school facilities will need to be strictly controlled for operational and security reasons. Playing fields are considered to constitute an outdoor recreation facility rather than an amenity space with public access. Moreover, it is our view that designating all school playing fields in this way may not allow for future operational development needs to be met through the expansion of schools on their existing sites. This might lead to additional land, potentially in the Green Belt, being required for the provision of future education facilities.

Whilst the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 74 states that existing playing fields should not be built on, at paragraph 72, it requires local planning authorities to give great weight to the need to expand schools. In addition, playing fields are considered to be appropriately protected already under statute as they cannot be redeveloped without prior consent from the Secretary of State for Education under Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act 1998.

We fully accept that the loss of a school playing field should be wholly exceptional as an option of last resort. However, the county council is increasingly required to expand schools to meet the need for additional school places generated by population growth and new development. Such expansions can sometimes only be accommodated by extending a school onto part of the playing fields. It is considered that this should be facilitated by the Local Plan rather than imposing a requirement to routinely have to make exceptions to policy for even minor extensions to schools. Therefore, we consider that the presumption against the loss of playing fields should be set against the need to provide essential education infrastructure to reflect the NPPF.

Policy R5 (Protection of Open Space) in the 2003 Guildford Local Plan set out an exception for school playing fields “where the proposed new development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on the site.” We would like to see a similar exception included in Policy 14: Green and Blue Infrastructure, particularly given that a number of school expansions are identified in the Plan’s Infrastructure Schedule as needed to deliver the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Policy I4**

Page 118

Policy I4 seeks to protect open space from development in accordance with the NPPF. However, whilst NPPF paragraph 74 states that existing playing fields should not be built on, paragraph 72, requires local planning authorities to give great weight to the need to expand schools. We accept the need to protect school playing fields, however, this should be more clearly balanced against the need for education facilities. Policy R5 in the 2003 Guildford Local Plan included an exception for school playing fields “where the proposed new development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on the site.” We would like to see a similar exception included in Policy I4 Green and Blue Infrastructure, particularly given that a number of school expansions are identified in the Plan’s Infrastructure Schedule as needed to deliver the Plan. It should be noted that permission for school expansion schemes that will significantly impact on school playing fields is only very rarely sought by the county council as a last resort and such proposals require approval from the Secretary of State.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 118 states that "planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss."

Natural England’s standing advice for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees (published April 2014), paragraph 4.8.1 states: ‘Ancient woodland is of prime ecological and landscape importance, providing a vital part of a rich and diverse countryside. In particular, ancient woodland:

• is exceptionally rich in wildlife, and supports many rare and threatened species;
• may contain surviving descendants and features from the original natural forests;
• acts as reservoirs from which wildlife can spread into new woodlands;
• has valuable soils due to their undisturbed nature;
• is an integral part of England’s historic landscapes and the biological and visual functioning of a landscape;
• contains a wealth of features of historical and archaeological importance little altered by modern cultivation or disturbance;
• contributes to people's sense of place and imagination.’

Keepers of Time, a statement of Policy for England’s Ancient and Native woodland jointly written by Defra and the Forestry Commission states that “the existing area of ancient woodland should be maintained and there should be a net increase in the area of native woodland.” One of the objectives set out in Keepers of Time is to “take steps to avoid losses of ancient woodland and of ancient and veteran trees and to sustain the total extent of other native woodland (ensuring that gains exceed losses).”

The Government Forestry & Woodlands Policy Statement (2013) confirms the Government’s commitment to Keepers of Time. Keepers of Time recognises a number of threats to ancient woodland, making specific reference to the threat posed by development pressures:

‘There are still occasions where native and ancient woodland is threatened by development, and many woods suffer attrition through incursions at their boundaries. Even if the woodland itself is protected, it can suffer serious disturbance where houses or roads are built right up to its margins, both directly from the impact of development, or indirectly through changes to drainage.’

**Impacts on ancient woodland**

Approximately one quarter of priority UK BAP species are associated with woodland habitats. Forests, woods, and trees make a significant contribution to biodiversity, and ancient sites are recognised as being of particular value. Due to their longevity, ancient woodlands are more species rich, and are often refuges for specialist woodland species that struggle to colonise new areas.

Development within ancient woodland can lead to long-term changes in species composition, particularly ground flora and sensitive fauna, i.e. nesting birds, mammals and reptiles. Majorly adverse impacts occur as a result of the removal of large areas of woodland to make way for new development.

Furthermore development adjacent to ancient woodland results in more intensive land use, meaning that plant and animal populations are exposed to environmental impacts from outside of the woodland. In particular, the habitats will become more vulnerable to the outside influences, or edge effects, that result from the adjacent land’s change of use. Detrimental edge effects can result in changes to the environmental conditions within ancient woodland, consequently affecting the wood’s stable conditions. Detrimental edge effects have been shown to penetrate woodland causing changes in ancient woodland characteristics that extend up to three times the canopy height in from the forest edges.

As part of the Proposed Submission Local Plan, Guildford Borough Council has outlined areas for future development. As indicated by the table included at the end of the document there are areas of ancient woodland included within sites allocated for future development. The Trust is concerned that the large number of ancient woods that have been included within sites for future development leaves these woods open to potential damage and loss.

Creation of new areas of woodland or buffer zones around semi-natural habitats, and more particularly ancient woodland, will help to reduce and ameliorate the impact of damaging edge effects, serving to improve their sustainability. The size of the buffer is dependent on the intensity of land use in the intervening matrix between ancient woods.
Natural England’s standing advice for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees, paragraph 6.4, highlights the importance of keeping development away from ancient woodland and buffering it where necessary:

“Development must be kept as far as possible from ancient woodland, with a buffer area maintained between the ancient woodland and any development boundary. An appropriate buffer area will depend on the local circumstances and the type of development. In a planning case in West Sussex the Secretary of State supported the arguments for a 15m buffer around the affected ancient woodland, but larger buffers may be required.”

The size of a number of the site allocations suggests that large scale development could potentially take place. The minimum 15m buffer recommendation to all development is not effective in ensuring that ancient woodland within and/or adjacent to site allocations is not affected by potential future development. Buffers should be constructed on a case-by-case basis rather than a ‘one size fits all’ approach. The Trust recommends that 15m is an absolute minimum and only suitable for small developments; larger buffers should be sought at every opportunity.

**Conclusion**

The Trust is concerned about the potentially adverse impacts that the proposed site allocations will have in relation to areas of ancient woodland within and/or adjacent to site allocations. Ancient woodland is irreplaceable; once lost it cannot be re-created. Ancient woodland should not be included in areas that are allocated for development, whether for residential, leisure or community purposes as this leaves them open to the impacts of development.

The Woodland Trust objects to the inclusion of the below site allocations in the Guildford borough Proposed Submission Local Plan as they are likely to cause damage and/or loss to areas of ancient woodland within or adjacent to their boundaries. For this reason we believe the sites in the table below are unsound and should not be taken forward.

Secondary woodland should also be retained to ensure that ecological networks are maintained and enhanced.

We hope you find our comments to be of use to you. The Woodland Trust is happy to provide any additional information or support regarding the protection of ancient woodland.

If you require any further information regarding points raised within this document, then please do not hesitate to contact us.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I OBJECT TO POLICY I4 (GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE): • Policy cancelled out by huge developments across the countryside. No mention of opportunity costs of loss of Green Belt services and amenities (e.g. farming).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17460  Respondent: 15641281 / Paula Redmond  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a landscape and wildlife photographer and frequent visitor to Albury Heath, Blackheath and surrounding countryside and villages. Surrey has some of the most beautiful and rare countryside and species of flora and fauna in the UK, some of it’s habitats are unique and are of national and worldwide conservation importance.

I wish to object in the strongest terms possible to the application by IGas for production at the above site. As you know, planning applications have to be decided against national and local planning policy. The IGas proposals conflict with policies in the:

• National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
• Surrey Minerals Plan
• Guildford Local Plan
• Metropolitan Green Belt

The recent planning officers report defined the proposal as a “major development”. Under the NPPF paragraph 116, planning permission should be refused for major developments in AONBs except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest.

The planning officers accepted the development would have:

“some detrimental effect on the landscape and would not enhance the natural beauty of the AONB during either the construction or operational period.” That the proposal amounted to “significant harm” to the Green Belt by encroaching on openness.

The proposal also breached policies designed to protect the AONB in the Surrey Minerals Plan and Guildford Local Plan.

The Surrey Minerals Plan policies MC2 and MC14 state that minerals developments in the AONB can be approved only if they have been demonstrated to be in the public interest, there is a need for them and there will be no significant adverse impacts on the appearance, quality and character of the landscape.

Policies RE5 and RE6 in the Guildford Local Plan seek to conserve the visual quality or distinctive character of the AONB. Policy RE2 states that new building would be inappropriate unless it prevents sprawl, reserves character or assists urban regeneration.

The planning officers’ report also says that the proposal would harm ancient woodland by creating car parking on the access track. The NPPF says loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland has to be outweighed by benefits.

Ancient woodland, however, is exactly that ‘irreplaceable’. Even if ‘translocated’ or ‘compensated’ in some way (as is required by the LPPF), you cannot replace the wildlife habitats provided by ancient and veteran trees like for like, you cannot explain to the birds, mammals and insects who live, eat and breed there that they have to move, or those species that may use it as a stopover on migration, a wildlife corridor between the other important sites in the area, such as the SSSI site at Colyers Hanger and Blackheath. Surrey has 62 SSSIs, 54 of which are listed for their biological interest (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Sites_of_Special_Scientific_Interest_in_Surrey). We do not know what impact further development and disruption within these areas may have on the delicate balance of nature within them. Nature is
not contained - it moves, flies, burrows, swims, migrates through and between such sites, woodlands which are of national importance and rarity.

You cannot artificially replicate the balance of biodiversity that nature has created over decades if not hundreds of years (despite what the LPPF suggests). Removal of ancient trees and woodland and disturbance of soil beneath them releases carbon dioxide that is locked inside. Further, veteran trees have been shown to be up to 10 times more effective at absorbing carbon than new plantations. It takes further decades if not centuries for new plantations to develop the rich habitat potential of old woods, some delicately balanced, rare and endangered species never recover or take many years to recover or reestablish colonies. Stag beetles, for example, are a protected species that spend around 6 years of their lives unseen, underground in larvae form, in the soil under rotting wood commonly found in woodland. Nightingales return to the exact same tree each year to sing to attract a mate. Owls, bats and other creatures use holes in old trees to nest in. Conservationists and scientists are still researching the rapid declines in our native species and the impact that further declines may have on our ecosystem. The UK has lost 60% of all species in recent years. Most explanations given are urban development, loss of habitat, pollution and other human interventions. Trees, plants and many wildlife species are suffering diseases and attacks that they were not normally susceptible to. If 40,000 humans die from pollution related respiratory and cardio vascular diseases each year, you can imagine the effect on smaller organisms health and immune systems must be devastating.

I reject, in the strongest terms, the conclusion of the planning officer that all of the above negative impacts can simply be outweighed by a national ‘need’ for ‘indigenous’ gas supply.

The recently released DECC Committee on Climate Change report stipulates that UK onshore gas production should only be permitted if three vital conditions are in place (extract - link to full document is provided below):

Test 1: Well development, production and decommissioning emissions must be strictly limited. Emissions must be tightly regulated and closely monitored in order to ensure rapid action to address leaks.
- A range of technologies and techniques to limit methane emissions should be required, including 'reduced emissions completions' (also known as ‘green completions’) and liquid unloading mitigation technologies (e.g. plunger lift systems) should these be needed;
- A monitoring regime that catches potentially significant methane leaks early is essential in order to limit the impact of ‘super-emitters’;
- Production should not be allowed in areas where it would entail significant CO2 emissions resulting from the change in land use (e.g. areas with deep peat soils);
- The regulatory regime must require proper decommissioning of wells at the end of their lives. It must also ensure that the liability for emissions at this stage rests with the producer.

Test 2: Consumption – gas consumption must remain in line with carbon budgets requirements. UK unabated fossil energy consumption must be reduced over time within levels we have previously advised to be consistent with the carbon budgets. This means that UK shale gas production must displace imported gas rather than increasing domestic consumption.

Test 3: Accommodating shale gas production emissions within carbon budgets. Additional production emissions from shale gas wells will need to be offset through reductions elsewhere in the UK economy, such that overall effort to reduce emissions is sufficient to meet carbon budgets.


– none of these conditions, especially Carbon Capture and Storage technologies, are remotely certain to be met.

I implore you to reject this proposal in an AONB as there are no reasonable ‘exceptional circumstances’ and it is clearly not in the national public interest, given our legally binding climate change mitigation commitments, and it is certainly not in the local public interest.

Air pollution and emissions

The period of gas flaring is very concerning for a number of reasons.
The Research Journal of Environmental and Earth Sciences 4(5): 525-528, 2012 states:

‘Gas flares have harmful effects on the health and livelihood of the communities in their vicinity, as they release a variety of poisonous chemicals. Some of the combustion by-products include nitrogen oxides, sulphur dioxide, volatile organic compounds like benzene, toluene, xylene and hydrogen sulfide, as well as carcinogens like benzo(a)pyrene and dioxins. Humans exposed to such substances can suffer from variety of serious ill-health effects.’

No detailed analysis has been produced of the gas to be flared. This is a serious omission from the application.

Evidence of gas flaring from the USA and Australia suggests that the total harm caused by flaring pollutants is more than the sum of the individual components.

Natural gas processing is a significant source of fugitive emissions of both methane and volatile organic hydrocarbons (VOCs). The World Bank estimates that every year, some 360 million tonnes of CO2 is released to the atmosphere through flaring and venting. This has a detrimental effect on the environment, contributing significantly to global warming and acidification of both land and sea. A considerable proportion of this CO2 comes from the production of Oil and Gas. At a crucial point in human history, if we are to avoid runaway climate change ‘keeping it in the ground’ needs to be the concern of every public authority, and indeed the UK’s Climate Change Act 2008 places legal obligations on public bodies to comply with emission reductions targets relating to climate change. These duties require that a public body must, in exercising its functions, act in the way best calculated to contribute to the delivery of emissions reduction targets. Flaring is incompatible with this objective, which is why there are international calls for ‘green completions’, involving the capturing of the gas – this is not proposed at this site.

Gas compressor emissions

Very concerning for the local population is the proposed notion of powering the gas compressor by burning some of the gas from the well 24/7 for 15 years. There needs to be a detailed analysis of the effects of the exhaust emissions of this from a variety of aspects: human health, ecology, local amenity impacts e.g. from those using the nearby playing fields. Moreover, the effect on vegetation and local wildlife species at a time when many native and migratory species and their habitats are in drastic decline is likely to be very significant and totally unacceptable from a conservation point of view.

The environmental heating effect of methane is significantly higher than CO2. It is still a fossil fuel and at a time when we should be reducing UK and World dependence on fossil fuels we do not give a good impression to our European neighbours or the rest of the world by promoting this type of fuel production and adding to our own domestic fossil fuel output and pollutant totals. Given the extreme threats to the earth from climate change (the rebranded friendly term for global warming), rapid melting of the polar regions, more extreme weather - drought (it is estimated that 50 million people will be displaced due to desertification within 10 years), storms and floods (the UK has had some of the worst flooding and storms in history in recent years), earthquakes and forest fires (there have been record temperatures, dry periods/drought conditions in the US, Canada, Amazonia Rainforest and Russia in the last 12 months), etc, our relentless exploitation of our environment and ecosystems has the potential to snowball us into global disaster at a far greater rate than we or scientists first thought. Key ‘canary in the mine’ species are in grave danger of extinction, everyday species such as pollinators, bees, butterflies, many species of birds, are in desperate decline. Our whole ecosystem’s reproduction depends on these species. We must set an example to the rest of the world and make a commitment to ‘green’ energy, not just to less or differently polluting fuels. We cannot continue to ignore the global environmental implications of pollution as well as the local impacts. We cannot continue to ignore the place our plant and wildlife has in our ecosystems, our entire existence depends upon it.

"Methane is a more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide (CO2), trapping more heat in the atmosphere molecule-for-molecule. But it is much shorter-lived: it decays on a timescale of around 12 years, whereas around a fifth of the effect from CO2 remains even after 1,000 years. This means a unit emission of CO2 today will affect the climate in 2100 and beyond. In contrast, the same unit emission of methane will have little effect on climate in 2100, but a stronger effect on the climate of the next few decades" - This means that as well as our current CO2 emissions having a runaway train of environmental effects lasting hundreds of years, gas production will increase the ‘greenhouse gas’ heating effect in the shorter term, which is potentially far more damaging as weather systems, the oceans, wildlife and plant species struggle to adapt to the unnatural rate of change of temperature and seasonal variations and confusion. This also means that the local communities will have to suffer the effects of methane and other greenhouse gas emissions for many years a

The UK is also inexperienced in this field of gas production "the UK has no exploration flow data, let alone production data, it is too early to speculate on the likely productivity of UK wells"
This report shows that there are no certainties, about its potential yield and value to market, about safety, about the stability of our soil and infrastructure, about the expertise and experience of the employees, about the controls and monitoring that will protect the public and what contingencies would be in place should there be a major accident or leak or explosion at the site or during transportation. The safety and health of the public should be an absolute priority, even if this site did not involve destruction of woodland and damage to an AONB. The fact that it is an AONB means that testing out a fledgling gas extraction process, without knowing the consequences, is a recipe for disaster.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/17462  Respondent: 15641281 / Paula Redmond  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The 24/7 nature of operations means that noise and light pollution, as well as air pollution, will be a constant disturbance to local village residents and to wildlife for a 15 year period, damaging health, wellbeing, property values, access to local amenities, access for emergency vehicles and no let up in emissions so air quality has no chance to recover by even a small amount overnight. This will also affect the nocturnal species in the area, bats, owls, badgers, foxes, nightjars, hedgehogs to name just a few.

The potential long term and constant disturbance and damage caused to local populations and wildlife is entirely unacceptable.

Given the uncertainty of the future of UK regulation with our impending exit from the EU and the widespread environmental protection, of public health regulations, water purity directives, health and safety regulations, wildlife protection regulations, bird protection directives, etc. and the change of Prime Minister (it was David Cameron’s personal ambition to fast track licences for domestic gas production and fracking despite EU opposition and public opinion and protest against it, with complete disregard for all the protective laws in place to preserve AONBs, SSSIs, National Nature Reserves and SAPs and with overwhelming scientific and practical evidence of the hazards it can and has presented both in the US and during testing in the UK, where air and water have been polluted and localised earthquakes have been a result) and Cabinet, possibly even a General Election in the near future it could be potentially dangerous and unlawful to proceed with these plans.

I urge you most strongly and without hesitation to reject this proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16672  Respondent: 15649601 / Laura Bushnell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have outlined below some of my main concerns regarding the removal of Green Belt status from the proposed villages:

Loss of valuable open space

I object to the loss of open space which will result from the Countryside, Green Belt and Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) policies. Access to open space provides numerous educational and recreational activities and hence the loss of such land will lead to the irreversible loss of rural leisure and tourism amenities, profitable film locations and room for public facilities such as parks and burial grounds. The numerous beautiful open spaces in the area have led to it becoming one of the most popular areas of the country for road and off-road cycling, even attracting
events such as the annual Prudential RideLondon and the 2012 London Olympics. These events, as well as many further small-scale cycle events demonstrate the popularity of this area as being both rural and accessible from London and they contribute hugely to the local economy. The loss of open land in this area could therefore be detrimental to this and many similar recreational activities, forcing people to go further out from London or Guildford to find the open space they desire.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16681  Respondent: 15649601 / Laura Bushnell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Negative impact on wildlife and biodiversity

Building on the Green Belt will inevitably lead to an irreversible reduction in biodiversity and due to the proximity to the Surrey Hills AONB, this should be a major cause for concern. Many species, such as the Dartford Warbler and Red Kite, currently found in this area are already highly vulnerable and therefore the loss of greenbelt land as well as the increased volume of people and traffic will only worsen this. In addition, a significant increase in the human population will inevitably lead to an increase in the predatory cat population which will cause further losses amongst these species.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPP16/16795  Respondent: 15652833 / Don Babington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The natural habitat of wild life being substantially

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp171/3268  Respondent: 15672545 / Future Planning & Development (Garry Hutchinson)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

1 Introduction

1.1 Future Planning & Development provide planning advice to our client Send Surrey Ltd in respect of their site Land off Heath Drive, Send, Woking, Surrey, GU23 7EP (‘the site’).

1.2 This Statement has been prepared in response to Guildford Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan (‘the Local Plan’) consultation (Regulation 19) which ends on 24 July 2017. The current consultation is effectively an update
to the Regulation 19 consultation, in July 2016, to which Send Surrey Limited made representations. The July 2016 representations are provided in Appendix 1.

1.3 The updated Regulation 19 Local Plan carries forward the site’s draft Open Space allocation. Our previous Regulation 19 consultation response made the case that this draft allocation was not sound in accordance with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Our representations also made the case that the Local Plan was not sound because it did not allocate sufficient land to meet with the identified housing need in the borough.

1.4 This Statement provides an update with regards to the two main topic areas: Open Space and Housing. Firstly, the statement presents further evidence to demonstrate that the draft Open Space allocation has been wrongly applied. This includes an Opinion from Andrew Tabachnik QC which states that the Open Space allocation is “unequivocally inappropriate and unlawful”. Secondly, the statement presents evidence to demonstrate that the site is deliverable for housing; this includes evidence to demonstrate that any potential site constraints, i.e. ownership, access, trees and ecology, will not impede the delivery of the site. This is also supported by a pre-application response from Guildford from July 2017 that confirms that the principle of residential development is acceptable. Accordingly, both topics will be addressed in the following sections.

2 Grounds for Draft Open Space Allocation to be Removed

2.1 Open Space is defined in the NPPF as: “All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity”.

2.2 Paragraph 72 of the NPPF states “Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.”

2.3 The site was initially proposed to be allocated as Open Space under policy I4 in the Submission Version Local Plan (Regulation 19) in 2016. This draft allocation was justified by the evidence prepared in support of the policy, this being the Guildford Open Space, Sport & Recreation Assessment 2016 – 2033 (June 2016) in addition to the Assessment of Sites for Amenity Value (May 2016).

2.4 The evidence base studies have been updated following the previous Regulation 19 Consultation. The Assessment of sites for Amenity Value 2017 was published in June 2017 and the Guildford Open Space, Sport & Recreation Assessment 2017.

2.5 The allocation of the site under Policy IC4 (renamed from I4) remains in the current updated Submission Version of the Local Plan.

2.6 The site has been reclassified as “private space” in the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Assessment. This indicates that it has no open space value for recreation. As such, we understand that the site is only allocated as open space for its amenity value. This was confirmed by the officer dealing with open space policy (Mr Dan Knowles) in an email to Send Surrey Limited on 8 May 2017 (Appendix 2).

2.7 The site is only allocated as Open Space for its amenity value. Fundamentally, this is not in accordance with national planning policy because it does not meet with the purpose of allocating land as Open Space.

2.8 Send Surrey Limited obtained advice from Counsel in February 2017. Our Barrister - Andrew Tabachnik QC - has provided his Opinion on the draft Open Space allocation; this is attached in Appendix 3.

2.9 Andrew Tabachnik QC concludes his Opinion as follows: “I have no hesitation in concluding that the draft allocation of the Site as “open space” is inappropriate and unlawful. The Site does not fulfil the requirements set out in the NPPF, and the evidence base relied upon was materially flawed”.

2.10 Notwithstanding the fundamental fact that the site does not accord with national planning policy, it is also clear that the allocation of the site for its amenity value is unnecessary. The Open Space allocation adds another policy designation simply to satisfy the deficiency in open space provision in Send identified in the evidence base.
2.11 The 2017 amenity assessment indicates that the site is of ‘medium’ value and comments that “Partial development could retain and potentially improve amenity value” (page 139). The amenity value has been downgraded from ‘high’ in the 2016 assessment to ‘medium’, we assume on the basis that the site has been correctly identified as being private land (the site was incorrectly identified as public land in the 2016 evidence base documents).

2.12 It is also important to note that the site’s assessment methodology which is set out in the Amenity Audit Spreadsheet has not been made available to Send Surrey Limited. A request to obtain a copy of this was denied by the Council. We therefore request that the Inspector makes this document available at Examination.

2.13 The analysis of the results in Section 5 of the assessment states:

A number of sites scored either Medium or High for their amenity value, and it is these sites which should be protected as Open Space. A number of sites that scored Medium or High may not require protection as Open Space because their amenity value could be retained or enhanced if the site is developed (or only partially developed).

2.14 The amenity value of our site could be retained or enhanced if the site is developed. The site is clearly developable, and therefore, in accordance with this guidance, it does not require protection as open space. This is further evidenced by the fact that Send Surrey Limited has received pre-application advice from the Council to state that the site is developable subject to retaining the features of amenity value (Appendix 4).

2.15 Furthermore, the site is covered by a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO). This, in itself, protects the features which provide the site’s amenity value, the trees. The TPO is given in Appendix 5.

2.16 Whilst on its own merits the site has some amenity value; this amenity value can only be appreciated in the wider context of the surrounding area. The allocation of open space for amenity value can be justified in built-up or densely populated areas where open space provides visual relief and ‘breathing space’. In this instance however, there is no need for an open space designation. The site abuts the Green Belt on the northern boundary; beyond this boundary there is open countryside, a vast expanse of open space. There is no need to allocate a parcel of land on the edge of the Green Belt as open space. Additionally, the site is on the side of the village, therefore its openness cannot be appreciated; it simply appears to be the edge of the village. Open space should only be designated for amenity when it is in an appropriate location which allows it to be appreciated as such, i.e. a village green.

2.17 Allocating the site for amenity value in this instance is incorrect. It is not central to the village; the visual interest and/or visual relief it provides to residents is very limited; it is not distinguishable by virtue of the fact it lies on the village edge and it abuts the Green Belt which is a vast expanse of open countryside whereby the inherent characteristic is openness.

2.18 Taking into account the above reasons and the group TPO, the allocation of the site for open space on the basis of its amenity value alone is both unsuitable and unnecessary.

4 Summary of Further Recommended Modification of the Plan

4.1 This Statement has provided further evidence to support the removal of the draft Open Space allocation of the site in the Submission Version Local Plan and also to have the site assessed as a housing allocation.

4.2 The evidence presented with regard to the Open Space allocation is unequivocal in that the proposed allocation is inappropriate and unlawful.

4.3 The allocation of the site on the basis of its amenity value alone cannot be justified. Furthermore, the allocation of the site for its amenity value alone is both unsuitable and unnecessary. It is unsuitable because the site is located in an area which does not provide any benefit as open space being on the edge of the built-up area and adjoining Green Belt. It is unnecessary because the existing group TPO is sufficient to ensure that the amenity value of the site, i.e. the trees, is protected.

4.4 With regards to the consideration of the site as a housing allocation, this Statement has demonstrated that there are no over-riding constraints to stop the site being delivered for housing in the short-term. A residential development could proceed on site with suitable access and no harmful impact on trees or biodiversity subject to mitigation measures.
4.5 It has also been demonstrated, with regards to housing, that the site could provide a policy compliant amount of affordable housing and could also provide a housing mix to meet the identified need in the SHMA. The site could also deliver sufficient affordable housing to meet with the current local housing need at ward level.

4.6 The reasons set out in this Statement, it is respectfully requested that the draft Open Space allocation is omitted from the next version of the Local Plan. It is also requested that the site is considered for housing development in accordance with the evidence submitted.

1 http://www.guildford.gov.uk/newlocalplan/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=24663&p=0 (Section 5 - . The Assessment of sites for Amenity Value 2017)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Local Plan Representation - Send Surrey Limited - Part 2 of 2.pdf (9.8 MB)
Local Plan Representation - Send Surrey Limited - Part 1 of 2.pdf (4.8 MB)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Infrastructure Policies: The infrastructure policies are sensible. Policy 13 "Sustainable transport for new developments" and Policy 14 "Green and blue infrastructure" are important and I support each of them. Blackwell distinguishes itself in each of these areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The sites contain a substantial number of trees many of which are quite mature and must make a significant contribution to the Borough's carbon reduction target. It seems perverse that planning permissions have been refused because of the impact on the individual trees whilst the wholesale destruction of woods seems inevitable if these sites are included.

It seems difficult to reconcile these two extreme positions.

If included in the plan preservation orders should be placed on appropriate trees as a minimum requirement.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy I4 green and blue infrastructure.

This policy is a box-ticking exercise with no teeth to it. It sits oddly with the plan’s onslaught on the Green Belt. The plan to build on large areas of countryside and to inset villages will cancel out any benefits from extending the principle of enhancing biodiversity beyond Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.

There is no mention of the value of wildlife gardening to biodiversity or the important role that larger gardens play in a village setting.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/17618</th>
<th>Respondent: 15689953 / Environment Agency (Oliver Rathmill)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Policy I4 – Green and blue infrastructure</td>
<td>We welcome and support this policy and specifically the commitment to protect and enhance waterways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Points of accuracy and clarity</td>
<td>Paragraph 4.6.35 – We welcome the production of a separate Development Management Policy (DMP) and a Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to set out how ecological networks will be managed and enhanced. We would like to be involved in this and suggest that separate policies and guidance are written for biodiversity and the water environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Indicators Table – In the interests of clarity and accuracy we note that progress on WFD objectives will be reported by the Environment Agency, not Natural England.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: pslp171/1834</td>
<td>Respondent: 15689953 / Environment Agency (Oliver Rathmill)</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( No ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Policy ID4: Green and blue infrastructure</td>
<td>We welcome and support the recognition of the differences between green and blue infrastructure. We recommend that use of the word “waterways” is changed to “watercourses”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document, paragraph 4.6.35</td>
<td>We recommend that separate development management policies are written for Biodiversity, Green Infrastructure and Open Spaces and The protection and enhancement of river corridors. Please refer to policies DM11, DM12, DM13, DM14, DM15 and DM16 of Wycombe District Council's Local Plan. We would also welcome the inclusion of a separate advice note on watercourses, similar to the one produced for Wycombe District Council (River Wye Advice Note) which really values the watercourses as an important asset in its district and provides advice to developers and landowners on how to protect and enhance the river environment. The River Wye Advice Note includes sections on the design of new riverside development (and the inclusion of buffer zones); landscape design of the river bank; public access; surface water run-off and the avoidance of pollution and weirs/barriers to fish passage. We’d be happy to work with the Council on this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Blue Infrastructure

We welcome the reference to the Water Framework Directive in paragraph 4.6.40. However, we recommend that the following wording is used for the first sentence in this paragraph:

“The Water Framework Directive (WFD) requires all member states to achieve good ecological and good chemical status for all groundwater and surface water waterbodies by 2027 at the latest.”

2.2.3 Policy ID4: Green and blue infrastructure

In policy point (6) we recommend that mention of about non-native invasive species. Developments can result in the spread of non-native invasive species which have devastating ecological and economic impacts. Where identified, these species should be eradicated/controlled under an agreed scheme.

In policy point (7) we recommend that the second sentence is replaced with: “Development proposals that are likely to have an adverse impact on the functions and setting of any watercourse and its associated corridor will not be permitted. Development should seek to conserve and enhance the ecological, landscape and recreational value of the watercourse and its associated corridor through good design and seeking out opportunities to deliver WFD objectives.”

This policy should identify potential opportunities for aligning with Water Framework Directive (WFD) objectives and consider the pressures and aims outlined in the River Basin Management Plan (RBMP). For instance, many of the actions that have been highlighted to bring the River Wey into good ecological status involve re-naturalising the bank by removing hard engineering, encouraging natural buffer zones to the watercourse, removing barriers to fish and eel passage, reducing diffuse pollution and tackling non-native invasive species. Some WFD objectives can only be delivered via catchment wide/cross-boundary planning which the Wey Landscape Partnership (currently hosted by the Surrey Wildlife Trust) was set up to achieve - please see comment above on working in partnership and the Wey Habitat Restoration Strategy.

2.2.4 Buffer zone

Paragraph 4.6.48 to a buffer zone for non-navigable rivers. Please note that all rivers (navigable or not) should be protected and enhanced by an 8m wide minimum undeveloped buffer zone (measured from bank top) on both sides of the river. Bank top is defined as the point at which the bank meets the level of the surrounding land. 8m is the minimum required for main rivers under the Thames Region land drainage byelaws.

However, on a greenfield site where there is plenty of land available, we would expect to see a wider buffer zone of a minimum of 10m on both sides of the watercourse that varies in size and shape to include larger areas. It may be appropriate to look at a much larger buffer on certain sites but this should be assessed on a site by site basis. The provision of a buffer zone should also be supported by a long term ecological management plan.

2.2.5 Key evidence

We note that the WQA is not referenced with the key evidence green box but this document provides evidence to underpin this policy and should therefore be included.


What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

“watercourses”.

“The Water Framework Directive (WFD) requires all member states to achieve good ecological and good chemical status for all groundwater and surface water waterbodies by 2027 at the latest.”

“Development proposals that are likely to have an adverse impact on the functions and setting of any watercourse and its associated corridor will not be permitted. Development should seek to conserve and enhance the ecological, landscape and recreational value of the watercourse and its associated corridor through good design and seeking out opportunities to deliver WFD objectives.”

Attached documents:
The area is a haven for wildlife, some of which is already endangered. The introduction of residences would mean the import into an ecologically sensitive area not only of humans and their increased footfall, but also of pets, and cats and dogs in particular, that can have a devastating effect on wildlife. Protected species on and near the site and wildlife corridors would be destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) seem to have been heavily influenced by the proposal of new identified settlement boundaries, in this draft local plan. The proposal in themselves have not been fully considered; they threaten landscape and biodiversity. Biodiversity will be seriously damaged by the many greenfield development sites proposed. We are suspicious of the use of the phrase “where possible”, which is a letout. Important habitats for biodiversity (outside BOAs) include many which are not adjacent to BOAs. There is no proper concern for protection of such areas.

4.6.45 is misleading. The primary ostensible role of SANGs is to divert recreational use, and dog-walkers in particular, away from the TBHSPA. It is extremely doubtful whether new SANG will achieve its primary purpose. For example, dog walkers are being encouraged to use sites occupied by ground-nesting Skylarks. It is wrong to claim, in effect, that SANG will produce net gains in biodiversity when it will be used to justify the destruction of existing wildlife on greenfield sites by building on it.

Land used for SANG should be made attractive in order to divert recreational use away from the SPA; but this cannot be achieved by a SANG which is adjacent to the SPA or many of the sites proposed.

We object to the introduction of 4.6.49a which appears to be an afterthought to weaken the policy.

Existing biodiversity and recreational use is being ignored by Guildford Borough Council and developers in selecting sites. In practice, SANG is being used in order to avoid any restriction on housebuilding due to the SPA; and is effectively a Trojan horse. Furthermore, all such sites are by definition already green spaces with either biodiversity or recreational uses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the insetting of 14 villages from the Green Belt in Guildford, and the proposal that infilling is acceptable within a further 12 villages within the Green Belt. I am also concerned that infilling is also proposed outside the settlement boundaries of 11 further villages. “Infilling” is merely a disguise, a pretence for developing Green Belt land.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPP16/15576</th>
<th>Respondent: 15977889 / Charles Kimpton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT. The current plan envisions building on large areas of countryside – at odds with its concern to enhance biodiversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/3533</th>
<th>Respondent: 16209409 / Natural England (Amy Steel)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Policy ID4: Green and Blue Infrastructure  
We would recommend that in point (1) the word maintain is added to accompany conserve and enhance. |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/4</th>
<th>Respondent: 17070913 / Green Reach Limited (Matthew Estwick)</th>
<th>Agent: Obsidian Strategic (Philip Scott)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( Yes ), is Sound? ( Yes ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We strongly support the proposed changes contained in the Proposed Submission Local Plan in particular those changes and modifications that support appropriate and necessary mitigation for the Thames Basin Heaths SPA including the Council's continued promotion of SANG8 'Land Adjacent to Long Reach' which is supported by Natural England which will function as a strategic SANG and deliver significant net benefits towards habitat creation and biodiversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp171/3513</th>
<th>Respondent: 17345441 / Thakeham Homes (Sarah Sutcliffe)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy ID4: Green and Blue Infrastructure

Thakeham continues to object to the proposed designation of the site as ‘Open Space’ and the findings of the Council’s Assessment of Sites for Amenity Value 2017 (Document Reference T16), which has informed this designation.

Open Space is defined in the NPPF as follows:

“All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity”

NPPF, Page 54

With respect to open space designations in the Proposed Submission Plan, Policy ID4 states:

‘Open space (encompassing all open space within urban areas, land designated as Open Space on the Policies Map and all land and water that provides opportunities for recreation and sport as identified in in the most recent Open Space, Sports and Recreation Assessment) will be protected from development in accordance with national planning policy.’

Supporting Paragraph 4.6.49 provides a definition of Open Space:

‘Open space for the purpose of policy ID4, is defined as all types of open land, both public and private, of public sport/recreation and/or amenity value.’

Within the ‘reasoned justification’ for this policy at paragraph 4.6.55 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the Council explain that the Amenity Assessment 2017 has identified and informed the designation of Open Spaces across the Borough:

‘The Council has produced an Amenity Assessment to identify open spaces of public amenity value within villages that are inset from the Green Belt by the plan. This assessment looked at land within the proposed village inset boundaries, excluding land where inset boundaries were expanded to take in allocations on the edges of villages. Sites that were assessed as having public value are identified as Open Space on the Policies Map and will be protected in line with national planning policy to ensure that the value for which the space has been identified is retained. Open spaces outside inset village boundaries are protected by the Green Belt designation so have not been considered for further protection. Land of public value in inset villages that is used for sport and recreation is identified through the Open Space Sport and Recreation Assessment and will be protected in line with the NPPF.’

Following a site visit and basic desktop assessment, the Amenity Assessment 2017 deemed the site (Ref: ETH_088) had an amenity value score of ‘High’, accompanied by the following reasoning:

‘Site is a grass field which is inaccessible to the public. The site is adjacent to a private sports centre. There is also a PROW along the southern boundary. The site is in an elevated position and offers aesthetic value.’

As the site is private land which is inaccessible to the public and therefore has no amenity value with respect to providing opportunities for sports and recreation, it appears that the site has been designated entirely due to its ‘aesthetic value’ and that as a result the overall amenity value is scored as ‘High’. This is the only basis upon which the site is designated an Open Space within the Pre Submission Local Plan under Policy I4.

The site is well contained by high hedgerow to its southern boundaries adjacent to the public footpath, and is set substantially back from the road frontage of Chinthurst Lane. Due to the location and positioning of the site, there are very limited views towards the site from the public realm on Chinthurst Lane and further afield. The elevated position of the site means any views into the site from the tennis club are limited. The only views into the land are from private properties at first floor level, and limited views from the private sports club.

As per previous representations, and to demonstrate the minimal visual amenity value of this site, we have again appended a series of images at Appendix 2 which accompanied representations made in July 2016. These images show that the site is not visible from the public footpath, with the exception of over the entrance gate, and that there is very limited visibility towards the site from the public realm on Chinthurst Lane or the sports club.

We object to the conclusion within the Amenity Assessment that this site is of high amenity value and we consider that the proposed allocation of the land as Open Space should be removed from the Local Plan.
The designation of sites of no amenity value is not consistent with the NPPF and does not constitute positive planning and would seriously compromise the ability of the Borough to provide much needed housing in sustainable locations within the villages and towns.

For the reasons above, it is our view that the Council should review the evidence base, including the Amenity Assessment, and that the proposed Open Space allocation affecting this site should be removed to ensure that the plan reflects national planning policy.

This site is set within a highly sustainable location in the village, and would be suitable for residential development in the emerging plan period. Sites such as this within the village envelope can make an important contribution to meeting housing needs in the locality.

Availability, Suitability & Achievability

Availability

The NPPG provides the following guidance in regard to considering whether a site is available for development:

“A site is considered available for development, when, on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems, such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips tenancies or operation requirements of landowners. This will often mean that land is controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop”

NPPG Paragraph 021 Ref. 3-020-20140306

As highlighted within this representation, the site is controlled by Thakeham Homes Ltd and we wish to actively engage with the Council over the coming months prior to the submission of a full planning application for residential development.

Thakeham has a proven track record for delivering a number of high quality residential schemes across Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire and will be seeking to deliver circa 20 dwellings on the site with a view to commencing development on site at the earliest opportunity.

Suitability

The NPPG provides the following guidance when considering whether a site is suitable for development:

“Sites in existing development plans or with planning permission will generally be considered suitable for development although it may be necessary to assess whether circumstances have changed which would alter their suitability”

NPPG Paragraph 019 Ref. 019-20140306

The site lies within the village of Shalford which is proposed to be inset from the Green Belt. The site is surrounded by existing residential and commercial development on all of its boundaries. There are a number of services and facilities in the local area, including a railway station and an infant school. Physical constraints to development in this location are also minimal. The site lies comfortably within Flood Risk Zone 1, where there is considered to be the lowest level of fluvial flood risk. There are no major ecology constraints and the site lies a significant distance from the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.

Achievability

In determining whether a site is achievable for development, the NPPF provides the following guidance:

“A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of the site and the capacity of the developer to complete and let or sell the development over a certain period”

NPPG, Paragraph 021 Ref. 021-20140306

Given the acute housing need within the Borough and the relative lack of constraints affecting this site, it is considered that there is a reasonable prospect of residential development being achieved on site by 2021.
As stated above, Thakeham has a proven track record for delivering schemes of a similar size and scale throughout Surrey, Sussex and Hampshire, and has the capacity to deliver the development of the site to provide much needed new homes within the first 5 years of the plan period.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pslp171/1334</td>
<td>17373345</td>
<td>Owen Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy ID4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

ID4 POLICY ID4: Green and blue infrastructure

As previously stated, Sport England considers that the policy is not supported by a sufficiently robust and up to date assessment of needs for sport and recreation. This should be in the form of a Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) and a built or sports facilities strategy for the borough in accordance with Sport England’s guidance. Sport England does not consider that the council’s open space, sport and recreation assessment based on the out-of-date PPG17 – planning for open space, sport and recreation is adequate and addresses the sport and recreational needs for the borough.

Furthermore, Sport England opposes the addition of the following paragraph:

4.6.49a National planning policy requires great weight to be given to the need to create, expand or alter schools to meet the needs of existing and proposed communities. This will be taken into consideration if development is proposed on open space and the development meets a legitimate educational need that is appropriately met on the site.

Sport England is concerned that this weakens protection of existing sports facilities and playing field land and is inconsistent with Sport England’s planning objectives and para 74 of the NPPF which seek to protect existing sports facilities and playing field land against loss from development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 324.